

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 553. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 3199). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 554. Joint resolution amending section 3804 of the Internal Revenue Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 3200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CURTIS: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 9913. A bill to prevent penalties and additions to tax in case of failure to meet requirements with respect to estimated tax by reason of increases imposed by the Revenue Act of 1950; with amendment (Rept. No. 3201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8344. A bill to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930; with amendment (Rept. No. 3202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 8881. A bill to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 3203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDS: Committee of conference. S. 4234. An act to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency-relief assistance to Yugoslavia; without amendment (Rept. No. 3204). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 9919. A bill to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR:

H. R. 9920. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. R. 9921. A bill to amend the act of July 6, 1945, as amended, so as to reduce the number of grades for the various positions under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 9922. A bill to prohibit age requirements or limitations with respect to the appointment of persons to positions in the competitive civil service during periods of war or national emergency; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 9923. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 450 Members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 9924. A bill to authorize a Federal civil defense program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 9925. A bill to provide free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. J. Res. 551. Joint resolution to provide for the conveyance to Portland, Oreg., of cer-

tain property to be maintained by such city as an air-raid shelter during emergencies with the need therefor, and for other public and municipal purposes at all other times; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. J. Res. 552. Joint resolution to amend section 402 of the Defense Production Act so as to require that if price or wage controls are exercised under that section, they be exercised for prices and wages generally and ceilings be set at the levels prevailing from May 24, 1950, to June 24, 1950; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution amending section 3804 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. Con. Res. 295. Concurrent resolution for the release of Archbishop Stepinac and the Greek children held by Yugoslavia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. Res. 885. Resolution providing for investigation of low-flying airliners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Res. 886. Resolution to provide for a national call to prayer on Sunday, December 24, 1950; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOLLIVER:

H. R. 9926. A bill for the relief of Charlie Bodady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 9927. A bill for the relief of Mering Bichara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1950

(Legislative day of Monday, November 27, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Immanuel, God with us, again by Thy grace the journeying months have brought us near to the shining glory of the holy night. Amid the tumult and terror of man's inhumanity to man, we hear anew the tidings of the angels' song and the music that is not of earth.

May an understanding sympathy that knows no boundaries of border or race find lodging even in bitter hearts hardened by cynicism. May a longing for purity that sees God and the Godlike on the common earth be born in minds stained by unhallowed thoughts. Save us from a festivity that knows nothing of receptivity and from decoration that forgets dedication. May the holly of this joyous season enshrine the holy, and its crimson beads be but emblems of the myrrh of sacrifice, the gift of contrite hearts. We ask it in the name of Bethlehem's Babe. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On the request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 15, 1950, was dispensed with.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2733) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance by the Secretary of the Interior of the Canadian River reclamation project, Texas.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8344. An act to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930;

H. R. 9794. An act to amend section 22 (d) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 9913. An act to prevent penalties and additions to tax in case of failure to meet requirements with respect to estimated tax by reason of increases imposed by the Revenue Act of 1950;

H. R. 9920. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code; and

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution amending section 3804 of the Internal Revenue Code.

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to sit during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to sit this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON FINANCE TO MEET AND FILE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, speaking for the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to sit during this afternoon, and to file its report during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Carlson	Cordon
Anderson	Chapman	Donnell
Brewster	Chavez	Douglas
Butler	Clements	Dworshak
Byrd	Connally	Eastland

Ecton	Knowland	Nixon
Ellender	Langer	O'Connor
Frear	Leahy	O'Mahoney
Fulbright	Lehman	Pepper
George	Long	Robertson
Gillette	Lucas	Russell
Gurney	McCarran	Saltonstall
Hayden	McCarthy	Smith, Maine
Hendrickson	McClellan	Smith, N. J.
Hickenlooper	McFarland	Smith, N. C.
Hill	McKellar	Stennis
Hoey	McMahon	Taft
Holland	Magnuson	Taylor
Hunt	Malone	Thomas, Utah
Ives	Martin	Thye
Jenner	Maybank	Tobey
Johnson, Colo.	Millikin	Tydings
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	Watkins
Johnson, S. C.	Mundt	Wherry
Kem	Murray	Wiley
Kerr	Myers	Williams
Kilgore	Neely	Young

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] is detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

#### CONFERENCE BETWEEN PRESIDENT AND PRIME MINISTER ATTLEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 371.

#### NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATION OF ANNA M. ROSENBERG TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Armed Services Committee have reported favorably the nomination of Anna M. Rosenberg a sec-

ond time. That nomination will be taken up in executive session sometime this afternoon before the Senate finishes its business for the day.

#### AID TO YUGOSLAVIA—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, several Senators have asked about the conference report on the Yugoslav aid authorization bill. Let me inquire whether that is ready.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand that it is.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it possible that it may come before the Senate this afternoon?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is intended that it will come to us soon after 12:30 today.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator very much.

#### CREDENTIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Missouri, a Senator from that State, for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Missouri a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness His Excellency, our Governor, Forrest Smith, and our seal hereto affixed at Jefferson City, Mo., this 13th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1950.

FORREST SMITH,  
Governor.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL] WALTER H. TOBERMAN,  
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Iowa, a Senator from that State, for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF IOWA,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November 1950, BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Iowa a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the great seal of the State of Iowa. Done at Des Moines this 12th day of December in the year of our Lord 1950; of the State of Iowa the one hundred and third, and of the independence of the United States the one hundred and seventy-fourth.

WM. S. BEARDSLEY,  
Governor.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL] MELVIN D. SYNHORST,  
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the credentials of PATRICK A. McCARRAN, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nevada, a Senator from that State, for the term begin-

ning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify, that at a general election held in the State of Nevada on Tuesday, the 7th day of November 1950, PATRICK A. McCARRAN was duly elected by the qualified electors of the State of Nevada a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1951, having received the highest number of votes cast for said office at said election, as appears by the certificate of the duly constituted and qualified board of canvassers now on file in the office of the secretary of state at Carson City, Nev.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the great seal of State to be affixed at Carson City, this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1950.

VAILE PITTMAN,  
Governor.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL] JOHN KOONTZ,  
Secretary of State.  
By MURIEL LITTLEFIELD,  
Deputy.

Mr. ELLENDER presented the credentials of RUSSELL B. LONG, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana, a Senator from that State, for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF LOUISIANA,  
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1950, RUSSELL B. LONG was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Louisiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January 1951.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, Earl K. Long, and our seal hereto affixed, at Baton Rouge, this 13th day of December, in the year of our Lord, 1950.

EARL K. LONG,  
Governor.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL] J. R. NELSON,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. MARTIN presented the credentials of JAMES H. DUFF, duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Pennsylvania, a Senator from that State, for the term beginning January 3, 1951, which were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA,  
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1950, JAMES H. DUFF was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania a Senator from said Commonwealth to represent said Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States for the term of 6 years, beginning on the 3d day of January, 1951.

Witness: His Excellency, our Governor, JAMES H. DUFF, and our seal hereto affixed at the city of Harrisburg, Pa., this 6th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1950.

JAMES H. DUFF.

By the Governor:  
[SEAL] GENE SMITH,  
Secretary of the Commonwealth.



## TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and submit petitions, memorials, and other routine matters for the RECORD at this time, without engaging in debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A telegram embodying a resolution adopted by the governing board, Cooperative Bureau for Teachers, New York, N. Y., signed by Rosemary Park, chairman, relating to the assignment of manpower under universal military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A petition signed by Glenn Samson, and sundry other citizens of Bancroft, Nebr., relating to the recall of veterans into the armed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the general assembly of the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds, Inc., at Washington, D. C., relating to assistance to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the high court, Catholic Order of Foresters, Chicago, Ill., signed by Thomas R. Heaney, high chief ranger, relating to religious persecution in Yugoslavia; ordered to lie on the table.

The memorial of P. R. and Elsie Speckord, of Dundalk, Md., remonstrating against the confirmation of Anna Rosenberg as Assistant Secretary of Defense; ordered to lie on the table.

## EXTENSION OF INSTITUTIONAL ON-FARM TRAINING—RESOLUTION OF RICHLAND COUNTY (WIS.) BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from J. R. Annear, county clerk for Richland County, Wis., a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors of that county on November 1, 1950, pertaining to the vital subject of institutional on-the-farm training for veterans. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## Resolution 10

Resolution pertaining to petitioning Congressmen and Senators of this State to extend institutional on-farm-training law

The benefits to participating veterans of institutional on-farm training have been proven beyond doubt; and

The demand for such training has exceeded the facilities for training and it is certain that hundreds of veterans actively engaged in farming who have appreciated their need for training and have made application for such training will fail to find enrollment by the deadline of July 25, 1951; Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That whatever steps may be necessary should be taken to grant to those veterans who (1) are actively engaged in farming, (2) have made request for institutional on-farm training, (3) have had their farms surveyed by the nearest instructor in on-farm training, and who (4) have had their individual petition for training considered and approved by their local veterans training committee before July 25, 1951, the status of having been registered for on-farm training and the privilege of entering training on the earliest date training facilities can be provided them, even though such date be subsequent to July 25, 1951, but providing further that all training shall terminate July 25, 1956, per terms of the present law; be it further

*Resolved*, That the deadline date of July 25, 1951, be extended to include institutional, on-the-job, and apprentice training; be it further

*Resolved*, That the clerk mail copies of this resolution to the Congressmen from the Third Congressional District and to both Wisconsin United States Senators so that they may be acquainted with the desires of said board.

E. R. KELLER,  
ALVA E. MILLER,  
GEORGE SMART,  
TED JACOBSON,  
M. C. KINTZ,  
*Agriculture Committee.*

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 301. A bill for the relief of Joseph Bernstein (Rept. No. 2640);

S. 996. A bill for the relief of Aron Tejbuss Birenbaum (Rept. No. 2641);

S. 2458. A bill for the relief of Ruth Obre Dubonnet (Rept. No. 2642);

S. 2488. A bill for the relief of Jan Josef Wieckowski and his wife and daughter (Rept. No. 2643);

S. 2983. A bill for the relief of Nene Baalstad (Rept. No. 2677);

S. 3183. A bill for the relief of Zdenek Marek (Rept. No. 2646);

S. 3222. A bill for the relief of Dr. John Lien-kwei Tsang (Rept. No. 2647);

S. 3291. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shuh-Yuen Liu (Rept. No. 2648);

S. 3309. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alfredo Kraessel (Rept. No. 2649);

S. 3502. A bill for the relief of Ayako Chika (Rept. No. 2650);

S. 3601. A bill for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla (Rept. No. 2651);

S. 3688. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander V. Papanicolaou and his wife, Emilia (Rept. No. 2652);

S. 3695. A bill for the relief of Francis Kuen San Thu, Mary Luke Thu, Catherine Thu, Victoria Thu, and Anne Bernadette Thu (Rept. No. 2653);

S. 3703. A bill for the relief of Jacoba van Dorp (Rept. No. 2654);

S. 3841. A bill for the relief of Gertrud Lomnitz (Rept. No. 2655);

S. 3869. A bill for the relief of Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong (Rept. No. 2656);

S. 3878. A bill for the relief of Valmal Eileen Mackenzie (Rept. No. 2657);

S. 3940. A bill for the relief of John E. Turri and Edward H. Turri (Rept. No. 2658);

H. R. 4256. A bill for the relief of James A. G. Martindale (Rept. No. 2659);

H. R. 5782. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vera Raupe (Rept. No. 2660);

H. R. 8478. A bill for the relief of Bernard Spielmann (Rept. No. 2661);

H. R. 8868. A bill for the relief of Mary Valsamis Dendramis and Vassili G. Dendramis (Rept. No. 2678);

H. R. 8869. A bill for the relief of Lena Valsamis and Lucy Balosa Valsamis (Rept. No. 2662); and

H. R. 9286. A bill for the relief of Maria Manfrini (Rept. No. 2663).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 2767. A bill for the relief of Yoshiko Fukuda (Rept. No. 2644);

S. 2805. A bill authorizing the naturalization of George Aeton (Rept. No. 2664);

S. 2941. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 18, United States Code, relating to espionage and censorship (Rept. No. 2638);

S. 2965. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas (Rept. No. 2665);

S. 3077. A bill for the relief of Shizu Fujii and her son, Suenori Fujii (Rept. No. 2645);

S. 3149. A bill for the relief of Irene Garland (Rept. No. 2666);

S. 3155. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Shiraki (Rept. No. 2667);

S. 3335. A bill for the relief of Joseph Girardi (Rept. No. 2668);

S. 3408. A bill for the relief of Sophie Strauss (Rept. No. 2672);

S. 3572. A bill for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy (Rept. No. 2669);

S. 3737. A bill for the relief of William Greville Birkett (Rept. No. 2670);

S. 3860. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Okuni Kobayashi (Rept. No. 2671); and

S. 4106. A bill for the relief of Vernon Crudge (Rept. No. 2673).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 3312. A bill for the relief of Noriko Hori (also known as Julietta Hori) and her daughter, Francis Fay Willie (Rept. No. 2674);

S. 3345. A bill for the relief of Humayag Dildilan and his family (Rept. No. 2675); and

S. 3693. A bill for the relief of Toshi Koike (Rept. No. 2676).

## INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably an original resolution, increasing the limitation of expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 375) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the first section of Senate Resolution 93, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to June 22, 1949, increasing the limitation of expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, is amended by striking out "December 31, 1950," and inserting in lieu thereof "January 31, 1951."

# ARREST OF WITNESSES WHOSE TESTIMONY IS REQUIRED BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE INTERSTATE CRIME—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report the resolution (S. Res. 368) requiring the issuance of warrants of arrest for certain persons desired as witnesses before the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, with a recommendation that the resolution be referred to the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce, and I submit a report (No. 2639) thereon. Accompanying the report are minority views of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], which I ask may be printed with the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar, and, without objection, the report will be printed as requested by the Senator from Nevada.

## BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. SALTONSTALL introduced Senate bill 4261, to exempt members of the Armed Forces from the tax on admissions when admission is free of charge, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 4262. A bill to prevent penalties and additions to tax in case of failure to meet requirements with respect to estimated tax by reason of increases imposed by the Revenue Act of 1950; to the Committee on Finance.

## EXEMPTION FROM CERTAIN TAXES BY MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would exempt the payment of the excise tax by members of the Armed Forces in uniform in the case of an admission free of charge to an entertainment. I do this because I believe that when the person or people giving an entertainment contribute the tickets the Federal Government should be willing to relax the requirement that such free tickets be taxed in the case of men in uniform.

Perhaps the tax should be taken off on all admissions for our men now in uniform and in hospitals, but I certainly believe that the bill which I now send to the desk is a proper approach at the present time for the benefit of our boys in the services.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4261) to exempt members of the Armed Forces from the tax on admissions when admission is free of charge, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

## HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 9920. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1951, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 9802. An act to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 8344. An act to amend section 313 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930;

H. R. 9794. An act to amend section 22 (d) (6) of the Internal Revenue Code;

H. R. 9913. An act to prevent penalties and additions to tax in case of failure to meet requirements with respect to estimated tax by reason of increases imposed by the Revenue Act of 1950;

H. J. Res. 553. Joint resolution amending chapter 26 of the Internal Revenue Code; and

H. J. Res. 554. Joint resolution amending section 3804 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

## DEPENDENCE OF THE PEOPLE ON AGRICULTURE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELLENDER

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by him on the subject We Must Be Strong, delivered by him December 13, 1950, at Dallas, Tex., before the annual convention of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which appears in the Appendix.]

## UNITED STATES OF AMERICA VERSUS STATE OF LOUISIANA—REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM ON PROPOSED DECREE

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the defendant's reply to plaintiff's memorandum on proposed decree in the case of United States of America versus State of Louisiana, pending in the Supreme Court of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

## PROPOSED REMOVAL OF SECRETARY ACHESON—STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN AND NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. LEHMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement and several editorials and an article relating to the demand by the Republican caucuses of the Senate and House for the removal of Secretary Acheson, which appear in the Appendix.]

## THE ROLE OF CENTRAL BANKING—ADDRESS BY THOMAS B. MCCABE

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject The Role of Central Banking in Our Free Enterprise Society, delivered by Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, at the Alabama dinner of the American Newcomen Society, Birmingham, Ala., December 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE WAR WE ARE LOSING—SPEECH BY DR. GEORGE GALLUP

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "The War We Are Losing," delivered by Dr. George Gallup, before the National Municipal League Conference, at Buffalo, N. Y., on November 22, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE ROSENBERG INQUIRY—ARTICLE BY JOSEPH AND STEWART ALSOP

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Rosenberg Inquiry," written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of December 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

## HEAVY-HANDED DIPLOMACY MIFFS LATIN UN DELEGATES—ARTICLE FROM WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Heavy-Handed Diplomacy Miffs Latin

UN Delegates," written by Edward Tomlinson, and published in the Washington Sunday Star of December 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

## THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—EDITORIAL FROM THE SUBURBAN LIST

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Should Delay No More," written by Milo C. Reynolds and published in the Suburban List, at Essex Junction, Vt., of December 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

## ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—ARTICLE FROM THE WASHINGTON SUNDAY STAR

[Mr. THYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "St. Lawrence Seaway—Sponsors of Perennial Project Believe It May Be Approved as Step Toward Defense," written by Francis P. Douglas, and published in the Washington Sunday Star, December 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

## SALE OF WAR GOODS TO COMMUNIST CHINA BY BRITISH FIRMS—ARTICLE BY HOWARD NORTON

[Mr. O'CONOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Howard Norton, regarding the sale of war goods to Communist China by British firms, published in the Baltimore Sunday Sun, December 17, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John W. Gibson, of Michigan, to be a member of the Displaced Persons Commission.

## BERNARD F. ELMERS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same with amendments as follows: Page 1, line 3, strike out "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the funds appropriated for the International Refugee Organization"; Senate amendment numbered 1, in lieu of the sum inserted by the Senate amendment insert



"\$12,500"; amendment numbered 2, restore the language "personal injuries and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HARLEY M. KILGORE,  
WARREN G. MAGNUSON,  
ALEXANDER WILEY,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

WILLIAM T. BYRNE,  
WINFIELD K. DENTON,  
KENNETH B. KEATING,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question. Does the conference language reduce the amount involved?

Mr. KILGORE. No; the conference language increases the amount allowed by the Senate. The conferees were convinced, after conferring with the House, that the House amount as originally allowed was correct, and the conferees agreed to go along with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

#### A PLEA FOR NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 4 minutes on a matter which I believe will be of considerable interest to all Members of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Tennessee is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that Senators be seated, to listen to what I have to say; and I thank them heartily for doing so.

Mr. President, for many years the New York Times has printed in its Sunday edition a section entitled "The News of the Week in Review." I buy that newspaper every Sunday, primarily in order to read that section. Whoever prepares it has a master mind. In my opinion, yesterday's section was the best review ever published by that newspaper. I doubt that it could be improved upon. I know that I could not improve upon it. It should be read by every Senator and by every Member of the House of Representatives. It is most regrettable that in this time of trouble and distress it cannot be read by every American citizen. It describes the far eastern situation, the European troubles, the Russian aggression, and does so succinctly, concisely, and accurately, just as I believe those situations to be.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, all of the front page of section 4 of yesterday's edition of the New York Times and the first column and one-half of page 2-E of that section.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEWS OF THE WEEK IN REVIEW AS  
PRESIDENT TRUMAN ACTS TO MEET THE  
CHALLENGE OF COMMUNISM

#### MOBILIZATION TO MEET THE CHALLENGE

The United States moved last week to meet fully the challenge of international communism. Yesterday, for the second time in

a decade, while the United States was not yet at war, a national emergency was proclaimed. Once again the most powerful Nation on earth is to mobilize, to build a mighty armed force, to serve as the arsenal for its allies.

The challenge for the United States last week was undiminished. In Korea the massed forces of Communist China struck savagely in an effort to complete the defeat of American troops fighting under the United Nations banner.

In Europe, the western countries are virtually defenseless in the face of overwhelming Russian might. This week the top diplomatic official of the United States, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, is to meet in Brussels with the Foreign Ministers of the other Atlantic Pact countries. The mission is to launch a real rearmament of the Continent.

In a radio address to the Nation on Friday night, the President spelled out the challenge to the United States and its allies in the strongest terms. Mr. Truman said:

"Danger has been created by the rulers of the Soviet Union. . . . The forces of Communist imperialism burst out into open warfare in Korea. [The Communists] have shown that they are now willing to push the world to the brink of a general war to get what they want. This is the real meaning of the events that have been taking place in Korea. That is why we are in such grave danger."

#### UNITED STATES ACTS—A STATE OF EMERGENCY

The last time a national emergency was proclaimed in the United States was in May 1941. The British, with their dominions, were fighting alone against the dictators; the Germans were in process of driving them to a "little Dunkerque" from Crete. On the 27th—the day the Royal Navy gave Britain something to cheer about by sinking the battleship *Bismarck*—President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in a fireside chat:

"We will not accept a Hitler-dominated world. . . . I have tonight issued a proclamation that an unlimited national emergency exists."

The proclamation put America's mobilization into second speed; half a year later, with Pearl Harbor, it was to shift into high. In the peak years the Nation was to devote to war as much as \$90,000,000,000—nearly half of the National product then—and two-thirds of its industrial capacity. As many as 400,000 young men a month were drafted into the Armed Forces until they totaled more than 13,000,000.

Last Friday night, with America once again the main hope of the free world, President Harry S. Truman said:

"We cannot yield to aggression. . . . I will issue a proclamation tomorrow morning declaring that a national emergency exists."

Mr. Truman's proclamation served notice that it was time for the mobilization against the Communist threat to move into second speed. The question of whether or when the time will arrive for a high-speed mobilization is, of course, the question of a big war.

The President acted at the end of a week in which the sense of urgency in the Capital rose rapidly. At the beginning of the week he held important meetings with Democratic congressional leaders and with his civilian advisers on mobilization. On Wednesday and Thursday he and his highest counselors conferred in extraordinary sessions with congressional chieftans of both parties. There appeared to be broad agreement that in the light of Korea and its implications the Nation must take drastic action—action in military mobilization and in economic mobilization.

#### ON THE MILITARY FRONT

At the outbreak of the Korean war the United States Armed Forces totaled about 1,450,000 men. Many of these were tied down in various assignments—occupation

duty in Germany and Japan, antiaircraft defense of the United States, assignments to schools. On K-day there were only four divisions in the United States that could be sent out of the country.

The Armed Forces now are believed to total around 2,300,000 (the exact figures are secret). National Guard units and Reservists of all three service branches have been called up. For the Army, 210,000 men will have been drafted by the end of this month. Still the shortage of military manpower is extremely acute.

The defense budget has expanded much more rapidly. At K-day it was about \$13,-000,000,000. Congress has rapidly expanded the figure. A bill being rushed through Congress will put the total close to \$42,-000,000,000.

On Friday night Mr. Truman said:

"We are expanding our Armed Forces very rapidly. . . . Our next step is to increase the number of men and women on active duty to nearly three and a half million. . . . At the same time we will have a very rapid speed-up in the production of military equipment."

The President's words left much room for speculation about the Government's precise military objectives. According to informed observers, the picture is something like this:

As to manpower, the figure of 3,500,000 used by Mr. Truman indicates an expansion of about 1,200,000. About 21,000 of these will be in 2 National Guard divisions which, it was announced, will be called up in January. The only clues he gave on how long the total expansion would take were that the Army and Navy build-up would take a few months while the Air Force would take somewhat longer. Earlier in the week the Army gave another clue by asking Selective Service for 160,000 men in January and February instead of the 90,000 previously scheduled.

#### New rules for draft?

Moreover, new draft targets are thought likely to require changes in the draft law and regulations. Theoretically the law provides a draft reservoir of about 8,500,000 men between ages 19 and 26. But many of these are unfit. The law exempts veterans and gives deferments to certain students. The regulations are generous in granting deferments for married men, fathers, and essential workers.

As a result only about 1,000,000 are considered draftable. An additional 500,000 men come into draft age each year. But the feeling is that too little leeway is left for further expansion, if needed. Accordingly the administration may tighten up on deferments and ask Congress to amend the law—by, for example, broadening the age limits, extending the length of service from 21 to 24 months, and cutting down on exemptions.

As to military expenditure, the budget is expected to rise further—perhaps to \$50,-000,000,000—before the fiscal year ends next June 30. Where it will go from there Mr. Truman did not say. As one indication, however, he said that "within 1 year" from now plane production will quintuple and combat-vehicle production will quadruple.

Mr. Truman stressed that the mobilization was to rearm not only the United States but also the western Allies. Yesterday the State Department showed that the field of American concern is still broader by proposing a special conference of the foreign ministers of 21 American Republics.

#### ON THE ECONOMIC FRONT

Two world wars and the threat of a third have given the President a wide range of extraordinary powers. Notably there is the Second War Powers Act of 1917, amended in 1942. It still holds since World War II still is on officially. Under this and other laws the President has controls over shipping, communications, radio stations, and other fields. There also is the Defense Production

Act of 1950, enacted last September because of the Korean war. Under it the President has powers to control inflation and make sure defense production gets done.

Up to now Mr. Truman has followed a go-slow policy in using his powers. They have been delegated widely throughout the administration.

The general overseer, as Coordinator of Mobilization, has been W. Stuart Symington, Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. There is a new Economic Stabilization Agency under Alan Valentine, in charge of price and wage controls; it has scarcely functioned. In the Commerce Department there has been a National Production Authority under William H. Harrison; among other things it has fixed quotas on the non-military use of critical materials.

The Federal Reserve Board has restricted bank, consumer, and real-estate credit. The Labor Department has been dealing with manpower; Agriculture, food and farm machinery; Interior, fuels and power; the Interstate Commerce Commission, transportation. Collaterally, Congress has enacted higher income taxes for individuals and corporations, and an additional tax on corporate excess profits is in the works.

#### *Voluntary controls tried*

In this set-up two of the President's most drastic powers have been held in abeyance. The Defense Production Act permits him to impose price and wage ceilings—either generally or in selected industries, so long as wage controls accompany price controls. The administration has shied away from them on the ground that voluntary restraints should be given a chance to work.

In recent weeks the pressure for rigid controls has rapidly gathered force. Much of organized labor has won wage increases; these often have been followed by price increases. There have been fears that the wage-price spiral might get out of hand. The critical turn in world events, and the prospect of a far more strenuous American mobilization, have brought a general conviction that stricter controls are in order. If a clincher were needed, it came last Wednesday when General Motors, Ford, and eight other auto firms, asked by Mr. Valentine to withhold price increases on their cars voluntarily, said flatly "No"—higher labor and materials costs made price hikes necessary.

On Friday night Mr. Truman said:

"We can handle this production program, but it will require hard work. It will require us to make a lot of changes in our ordinary ways of doing things. . . . [It] will inevitably push up prices, unless we take positive action to hold them down."

In his speech the President spelled out the specific steps—and yesterday he began the process of putting them into action. These are the steps:

As to organization, Mr. Truman brought the entire economic mobilization under the central control of a new Office of Defense Mobilization. It will have charge of production, procurement, manpower, transportation, and economic stabilization. Its head, formally appointed yesterday, is Charles Edward Wilson, 64, president of General Electric for 11 years who was Vice Chairman of the War Production Board in World War II. (He is not to be confused with Charles Erwin Wilson, president of General Motors, who calls himself "Engine Charley" and his namesake "Electric Charley.")

Mr. Wilson will be free to decide whether to run the mobilization through scattered agencies as now or to merge them into a single agency. He will thus be a czar to a degree no man was in World War II. The closest approximation in that war was James F. Byrnes, who as head of the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion was called assistant president, but acted mainly as an umpire of interagency disputes.

#### *Ceilings—and autos*

As to controls, Mr. Truman said there would be moves at once to control prices of a number of materials and products. Wage controls will go along with the price controls. In addition, Mr. Truman said he would put before Congress still further taxes in order to help prevent inflation and put defense "as nearly as possible on a pay-as-you-go basis."

Last night the Economic Stabilization Agency issued the first price-ceiling order in the new program—and the first since OPA. It rolled auto prices back to the levels of December 1—before the recent increases. They will hold there until March 1, pending a thorough study of auto prices. Meanwhile ESA will study auto-wage stabilization. More price ceilings in other lines are expected to come.

Thus America is to live again, in some measure, the still-fresh memories of a mobilized economy—the shortages, the substitutes, the regulations, the longer working hours and, above all, the young men going away.

The President's proclamation yesterday served not only a legal purpose (it will add a few to his many powers) but also the psychological purpose of driving home to the people the need for the sacrifices ahead. For its part the Nation seemed united in its response to his call:

"I summon all citizens to make a united effort for the security and well-being of our beloved country."

#### *NO QUARTER ON KOREAN BATTLEFIELDS*

In Korea the United Nations army is split into two segments separated by 200 miles. Except where UN troops are in firm contact with the enemy, the tactical situation is obscure. It is hidden in a security silence which Tokyo headquarters imposed on Thursday to cloak troop movements. But the strategical picture is clear.

In the south, somewhere along the thirty-eighth parallel, units of Lt. Gen. Walton H. Walker's Eighth Army are deployed in strong points commanding the roads. This staggered defense line stretches from the west coast to the central mountain range. Defenses have also been mounted around the Inchon-Seoul area. Between the parallel and Pyongyang, the capital of North Korea, the Chinese commander, Lin Piao, is massing at least 150,000 men for an attack down the center of the peninsula which is designed to outflank and encircle the UN defenses.

In the northeast Maj. Gen. Edward M. Almond's Tenth Corps holds a narrow beachhead—its radius is less than 6 miles—around the port of Hungnam. Transports are tied up at the piers. Off shore stands the Seventh Fleet. Overhead, Marine and naval fighters are flying cover. Posted around the perimeter is a United States infantry division, fighting off probing attacks and determined to hold the line against an assault by 100,000 Chinese troops which is expected at any minute. The Tenth Corps is being evacuated. The evacuation has been going on all week. How many of the corp's 60,000 men are still in the beachhead is not known.

#### *UN plans secret*

What are the future plans of the United Nations high command? These, also, are a closely guarded secret. But one thing is clear. The Chinese Communists now have more than 300,000 men in Korea. In addition, there are nearly 100,000 North Korean troops, already operating in guerrilla bands or in reorganized units behind the front. Against this Communist mass, General MacArthur has 275,000 men.

If Mao's commander in Korea, Lin Piao, throws the full weight of his divisions across the thirty-eighth parallel, it will probably be impossible for the United Nations to hold a defense line across the whole width of the peninsula at the parallel.

It may be that the UN commander will decide to set up beachheads based upon Pusan in the south and Inchon in the west. Ringed with dug-in tanks and heavy artillery, covered by the big guns of the fleet and protected by air power, these beachheads could be held for some time, and could be reduced only at tremendous cost. Furthermore, both Inchon and Pusan—especially the latter—provide good facilities for evacuation if a final withdrawal becomes necessary.

The major fighting last week took place in the northeast. A week ago today Task Force Dog from the United States Third Division crashed through a Chinese roadblock deep in a gorge along the road between Hungnam and Hagaru, and linked up with the Marines and GI's that had fought their way out of the trap around the Changjin Reservoir. Men of the rescuing task force cut left and right of the road and held off 4 Chinese divisions coming in for the kill. Puerto Rican soldiers manned the heights along the canyon. The trucks carrying the Marines and GI's swept through. Last Monday night all the trapped force—between 20,000 and 25,000 men—was safe within the Hungnam beachhead. The next morning their rescuers joined them.

#### *Evacuation begins*

There was little time to lose. Three strong Chinese columns were surging down upon the beachhead—one along the coast, one behind the marines from Changjin Reservoir, a third between them. Last Wednesday the booms started swinging the tanks and trucks from the piers onto the waiting Victory and Liberty ships; soldiers moved up the gangways. Landing craft and launches put off from the fleet moored in the roadstead—the battleship *Missouri*, several cruisers, five flat-tops, a large number of destroyers, and auxiliary craft—to pick up more men. As the men were evacuated the outposts began pulling in.

A few hours before dawn on Friday morning came the dread beating of drums and blowing of bugles that herald a Chinese attack. An enemy force of 2,500, including Mongolians on ponies, hit the defense line west of Hungnam. The Chinese objective was the Hungnam airfield. There was bloody hand-to-hand fighting. Two United States platoons—about 100 men—were cut off; one of them was feared lost. Reinforcements were rushed in and the Communists were thrown back. One thousand Chinese lay dead in front of the UN line.

But all day Friday the pressure continued. On Saturday morning UN troops pulled out of the large industrial city of Hamhung, 6 miles northwest of Hungnam, as engineers blew the bridges and drove engines and railway cars into the chasm.

The Third Division, manning the perimeter, is confident it can hold until the evacuation is completed. Then the last rear guards will make a dash for the nearby airstrip and board the waiting planes. The Tenth Corps will have been saved.

#### *NO COMPROMISE IN UN DIPLOMACY*

The first Chinese Communist mission to the United Nations—a group of seven men and two women headed by General Wu Hsiuchuan—arrived at Lake Success 23 days ago. Officially the Chinese came to discuss their charge that the United States' action in throwing a naval blockade around Formosa constituted armed aggression against the Chinese Peoples Republic. But far more than that, General Wu used the UN forum to repeat Russia's bitter denunciations of the United States and the western democracies and to present far-reaching demands. He said, in effect: Get out of Korea. Get out of Formosa. Give us China's seat at the UN. In private talks with perhaps a dozen delegates, talks initiated in an effort to end



the intervention of Communist China—General Wu has been equally tough. All proposals made to him have met the same response: He nodded and agreed to transmit them to his government.

#### *Wu to the press*

Yesterday, for the first time, General Wu called a press conference. He called it in order to announce Peiping's answer to a cease-fire proposal the UN General Assembly had approved. General Wu, in effect, rejected the cease fire. Later it was disclosed that General Wu and his delegation plan to leave Lake Success this week.

The press conference came after a week of United Nations attempts to end the Korean war. These attempts turned on what kind of truce might be acceptable to both sides. The Chinese Communists had demanded what would amount to a "conditional cease-fire." Their price was a definite commitment that the United States would allow Peiping to take Formosa. The United States wanted an unconditional cease-fire. The United States position was that, once the Korean war was ended, we would discuss Formosa in the United Nations—but we would not negotiate at the point of a gun.

On Monday, at Lake Success, a group of Asian and Mideastern delegates led by India's Sir Benegal Rau drafted a package plan of two resolutions which they hoped would constitute a framework for reconciliation of the Chinese and American views. Resolution No. 1 proposed a three-man committee, including Assembly President Nasrallah Entezam of Iran, to "determine the basis on which a satisfactory cease-fire in Korea can be arranged." Resolution No. 2 called for appointment of a committee including the United States and possibly Communist China to draft plans for a general Far Eastern settlement—including Formosa's future status.

Only the first resolution came up for debate last week and only the Russian bloc opposed it. Russia's Jacob Malik called it an "Anglo-American device" designed to give the United States time to regain strength for further aggression. His opposition seemed to indicate that Moscow was pushing China to continue the war.

#### *Entezam, Rau, Pearson*

On Thursday the Assembly approved the resolution, 52 to 5. President Entezam then named the two other members of the cease-fire committee—Sir Benegal and Lester Pearson of Canada. On Friday they started sounding out the Americans and the Chinese Communists. On Friday evening General Wu conferred with UN Secretary General Trygve Lie for more than an hour. There were reports that General Wu had threatened to go back to Peiping unless the UN took up the Formosa problem immediately.

This was the background for yesterday's press conference, which was held in the Security Council chamber at Lake Success. General Wu read a four-page statement. He called the cease-fire proposal a trap; he said its real purpose was to tie [our] hands. But he said: "We are willing to try to advise the Chinese volunteers to bring to an early conclusion the military operations which they have been forced to undertake together with the [North] Korean People's Army in their resistance against the United States Armed Forces of aggression."

The Peiping delegation is to fly home on Tuesday. But despite their departure, efforts to work out some kind of cease-fire will continue—if not in the UN, then elsewhere.

#### *AND NOW EUROPE—TO BUILD WEST'S DEFENSES*

In Brussels, March 17, 1948—three weeks after the Communist coup in Czechoslovakia pushed Russia's sphere westward—five Western European countries signed an alliance. They were: Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg. The paper they signed said that if any treaty

member were attacked all would come to the victims defense. Actually, the five countries had little in the way of military power to put into the field.

In Brussels, tomorrow and Tuesday, there will take place a meeting of the members of a greatly expanded western alliance—the Atlantic pact. The foreign ministers of these countries will attend: the United States, Canada, the five Brussels pact countries, Italy, Portugal, Norway, Denmark, Iceland. The harsh fact is that, while the alliance has grown in numbers, the western powers have not got the armies to put up a serious defense of Western Europe. Russia's divisions, vastly outnumbering the West, could sweep quickly to the Atlantic and the English Channel.

What the pact members hope to accomplish at the Brussels Conference meetings, and at supplementary meetings, is to bring about a real rearmament of the West—including Western Germany. The idea is to provide a deterrent to a march of the Red Army. While the West could never build up enough armed strength to stop the Russians dead in event of war, it could build up a powerful force—powerful enough to show the Russians that an invasion of Western Europe would be a very costly affair. Thus, the theory goes, western rearmament may hold off the Russians.

#### *Foreign ministers prepare*

Last week the pact foreign ministers made careful preparations for the Brussels conference. In Washington Secretary of State Dean Acheson, despite the demands of the Korean crisis, spent much time on the European defense problem. Experts briefed him. He read papers—some by John McCloy, United States High Commissioner in Germany—on the German troop question. He held long consultations on the question of Soviet intentions in Europe. Mr. Acheson leaves today by plane.

Mr. Acheson and his colleagues will have before them, for final approval, agreements already worked out by their lieutenants on three major aspects of western defense.

First, there is the general plan for a coordinated Atlantic defense force made up of the national armies of pact countries.

Second, there is the plan for a supreme commander of the Allied Atlantic force. The Ministers are expected to call on the United States to provide that commander. It is a foregone conclusion that he will be Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Third, there is the plan—a most controversial plan—for bringing Germans into the defense of Western Europe. It is a compromise plan between the views of the United States and France.

#### *Original positions*

Originally the United States argued that Europe could be defended only if strong German forces participated. It urged that 10 German divisions (a division is a self-contained military unit) be recruited for service in the Atlantic Force under orders of the Supreme Commander. France shrank from the idea. Her attitude stemmed from her deep-seated fear of rebirth of German military power; and an increasing fear that the reappearance of German divisions on the borders of Eastern Europe would provoke the Russians into marching. Last Wednesday in London, the pact minister's subordinates put the final touches on the compromise plan. The plan, in essence, is this.

About 150,000 German troops would be recruited under Allied supervision. They would be divided not in divisions but in regimental combat teams of not more than 6,000 soldiers each. These teams would be assimilated into divisions of the pact powers. While this process of recruitment goes on, France would try to work out a decision with other continental powers on a French project for a solution of the German rearmament

question. The project is for a European army in addition to the regular armies of the pact nations. The European army would have divisions made up of three combat teams each—one team French, another German, the third other European nationals.

Because of the harmony reported from London last Wednesday, there were many statements to the effect that the German rearmament question was at last settled. That may be true as far as the United States and France and the other pact nations are concerned, but it is far from true as far as Western Germany is concerned. The United States and its Allies have a big selling job ahead of them, for the West Germans do not like the compromise plan at all.

#### *Mood of Germans*

This is the West Germans' attitude: They fear a war in which the decisive battles very likely would be fought on German soil. They feel that a defense force under the compromise would be too weak. Many Germans are saying that they would rather be bolshevized than fight a war they could not win. That is the line of the Socialist Party in West Germany. But the Socialists would be willing to rearm—if rearmament were not hobbled by the conditions of the Allied plan. They want German divisions—in effect, a new German Army—and the commitment of very powerful American forces as proof that the west seriously intends to defend Germany. They want that—or no rearmament at all.

In recent state elections in West Germany, the Socialists, campaigning on their rearmament positions, made heavy gains at the expense of the Christian Democrats, the party of Konrad Adenauer, Chancellor of West Germany. Last Tuesday the Adenauer government took the Socialist position. A government spokesman said the Atlantic Pact compromise plan was unacceptable; that Germans would go along with rearmament only on the basis of full equality with the pact powers. Full equality would mean not only German divisions, but, for all practical purposes, complete sovereignty for West Germany.

#### *The Russian question*

At the Brussels Conference the pact ministers will discuss the question of what to do about the German attitude toward rearmament—and the Russian attitude. The Russians are engaged in an intense campaign to head off the rearmament of West Germany. Last October the Kremlin (which has allowed partial rearmament of East Germany), warned the United States, Britain, and France that the Soviet Union would not tolerate western rearmament. Maybe that statement means what it implies—that Russia would march if West Germany started to rearm—and maybe it is a bluff. But in any case that warning, and others like it, have had the effect of increasing fear among west Europeans—Germans included—of German rearmament. Apparently the Russians hope that fear will bring paralysis of the defense effort in the west. The Americans, in discussions with the west Europeans, have put emphasis on the United States stockpile of atomic bombs as a deterrent to Russia, at least as long as the present superiority in atomic weapons exists. But the Europeans are not so sure.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, perhaps I should stop here; but, because I believe our country to be in perhaps the greatest danger it has ever experienced, I am going to add a few words.

Mr. President, in my judgment, dangerous as our foreign enemies may be, our greatest danger lies here at home. Our greatest danger lies in the dissension and differences that I see constantly increasing. I have served in one or the

other of the two Houses of Congress for a period of nearly 40 years. During that long period of time I do not believe I have ever seen the Members of this body and the Members of the other body, or the people generally, ever working at such cross purposes. I do not believe I have ever seen them so critical of one another. I do not believe I have ever known our people, both in the Government and out of it, to be more critical, nor have I ever seen them show such utter disregard in many respects for our Constitution and laws. I do not believe I have ever read in our history of such a mix-up in world affairs as exists today.

Our possessions have been invaded, and our rights have been violated by other nations—nations, incidentally, as all of us know, to which we have been exceedingly kind, in fact, more than exceedingly kind, indeed to some of them we have been more kind than any other nation ever has been to another. Yet today we do not really know on which side any of these nations will be if the present troubled developments in the world lead to conflict.

All of this should make the citizens of the United States stay together and work only for our common country. The purpose of this short statement, Mr. President, is to urge each and every one of my colleagues, each and every American citizen, to stay together in this time of trouble. This is no time for dissension; it is no time to permit ourselves to become worked up over lesser questions and lesser matters. To my mind, it is our supreme moment; it is our greatest test.

The questions before us are, "Shall the greatest Constitution ever written and the greatest government ever devised by man and the freest and most successful and most prosperous people on earth, remain as presently set up; or are we to be taken over by Communists who believe neither in God nor in man? I pray to a just God that the answer to the last question will be no.

As my colleagues know, I am critical at times. I am not excusing myself. I do not blame others, including some Senators for being critical. But, Mr. President and fellow Senators, men with whom I have been associated for so long, and for whom I have such great respect, at this time of peril to our Government and of peril to our people, let us withhold our criticisms and dissensions until a more propitious occasion. Each one of us held up his hand before Almighty God and took an oath to defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

As all of us know, we cannot change our Government overnight; we cannot change our officials overnight, though a change can be made, of course, by means of impeachment in the House of Representatives and trial by the Senate. But the President of the United States, Mr. Truman, is our President, and will remain President until January 1953. In everything we do or say to discredit him we are helping the Russians, although not intentionally, of course. Nevertheless, regardless of whatever our inten-

tions may be or whatever our forgetfulness may be, the fact remains that we are helping the Russians when we pursue that course.

If we are forced into a war Mr. Truman will still be our Commander in Chief during that war. Whatever critics may say, we in the Senate who have served in this body with our President know that he is honest, we know that he is able, we know that he is courageous, and we know that he has the power to appoint his executive officers, by and with the consent of the Senate.

Let me remind the Senate that every one of these officers, some of whom are being criticized, was confirmed by our vote. We were for them, as the President was. We took part in it, as he did. He has appointed these officers, and we have approved them and have consented to their appointment. Some of them may not do just what we would have them do. Some of them have made mistakes. We all make mistakes. But let us get together behind our President and behind our Government. Let us build up our Army, our Navy, our Marine Corps, our Air Corps, and all our other defenses. I pray you, my colleagues, do not let it be said of us that it was during our service that the United States lost her first great conflict. Let us forget politics, forget differences, forget everything except that our Government and our people, and even our religion are in danger. Let us be united in the conflict which apparently is before us. I appeal personally to Senators, who constitute part of the greatest legislative body that has ever existed among men. I fear I have trespassed upon them, but I thank them with all my heart for the fine attention they have given me.

#### CONFERENCES BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND PRIME MINISTER ATTLEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, has the routine business been completed?

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further formal or routine matters, the Senator from Arkansas is recognized. The question before the Senate is the motion of the Senator from Missouri to proceed to the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 371) calling for a report on the discussions between the President of the United States and Prime Minister Attlee.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Arkansas will yield, we on this side of the aisle have no objection to permitting that motion to come up and making the resolution the pending business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the motion will be agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, what was the request?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request was that the motion to take up the resolution offered by the Senator from Missouri be agreed to, and that the resolution be placed before the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Arkansas yield for that purpose?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With the understanding that I may get the floor again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Arkansas yields for that purpose. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I have no disposition to object to a reference of the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, if there can be some understanding that it be reported back to the Senate promptly. Time is of the essence in the consideration of this resolution, if the session is permitted to expire with nothing done about the resolution it will be an idle and a futile thing.

The purpose of the resolution is very plain. It is to prevent another Yalta or another Potsdam, at which were made, on behalf of the American people, important agreements that will affect the American people for generations to come. Those agreements were not referred to the Senate but were consummated by the Executive Department of the Government in secret.

The resolution merely asks for a full and complete report of what was done at the recent conference between Mr. Attlee and Mr. Truman, and it asks that any agreements entered into at the conference should, under the Constitution, be embodied in a treaty which should be submitted to the Senate for ratification or rejection.

Mr. President, at the time the resolution was proposed I suggested to the distinguished Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, that there be some understanding that the resolution be reported either favorably or unfavorably at some definite time. He was not agreeable to that course. I hope he will reconsider and permit the resolution to be referred with some understanding as to the time at which it may be reported. It does not require extensive hearings. It involves merely a question of judgment. Every Member of the Committee is thoroughly advised as to the facts and circumstances of the underlying law. I hope that an understanding can be reached that the resolution shall go to the Committee on Foreign Relations and be reported in sufficient time to be acted upon at the present session.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has no power individually to pledge what the committee is going to do. That is why I proposed the resolution be referred to the committee, so as to let the committee decide when and if it wants to act on the resolution.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. In a moment. I took that course instead of the course which is sometimes taken of introducing a bill or resolution and demanding that



the committee act on it day after tomorrow.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. KEM. I should like to ask the Senator if I have failed to make myself clear? The suggestion was that the resolution be referred to the committee with a request, or with a direction, that it be reported on a day certain. I was not under the illusion that the chairman of the committee could bind the committee in that respect, but I think the Senate can do so. It can refer the resolution to the committee with instructions. There is nothing unusual about that. That was done in the case of the resolution of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] a few days ago in regard to subpoenaing some witnesses to appear before his subcommittee. There was general agreement, as I recall, that the resolution should go to the committee with instructions to report within a certain definite period. That is all we are asking in this instance, not that the chairman shall undertake to bind the committee with reference to anything, but merely that he agree that the Senate may direct the committee to report within a certain time.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, evidently I misunderstood the Senator, because he said he had no objection to the resolution being referred to the committee with the understanding, and so forth. Whose understanding?

Mr. KEM. The understanding of the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. There is nothing in the resolution with reference to that.

So, Mr. President, I insist on my motion that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations without any handicap, but leaving it to the fair judgment of the committee just as every other resolution or bill is left. Why should we choose this particular time to violate the rules which give every committee the opportunity to consider any measure which is referred to it? Let the committee consider it. Why should the Senator from Missouri direct what the Committee on Foreign Relations should or should not do?

I insist on my motion to refer the resolution to the committee, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from Texas concluded?

Mr. CONNALLY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Frear	Kem
Anderson	Fulbright	Kerr
Brewster	George	Knowland
Butler	Gurney	Langer
Carlson	Hayden	Leahy
Chapman	Hendrickson	Lehman
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Long
Clements	Hill	Lucas
Connally	Hoey	McCarran
Cordon	Holland	McCarthy
Donnell	Hunt	McClellan
Douglas	Ives	McFarland
Dworschak	Jenner	McKellar
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	McMahon
Ecton	Johnson, Tex.	Magnuson
Ellender	Johnston, S. C.	Malone

Martin	O'Mahoney	Taft
Maybank	Pepper	Taylor
Millikin	Robertson	Thye
Morse	Russell	Tydings
Mundt	Saltonstall	Watkins
Murray	Smith, Maine	Wherry
Neely	Smith, N. J.	Wiley
Nixon	Smith, N. C.	Williams
O'Connor	Stennis	Young

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I move that the motion of the Senator from Texas be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words:

That the committee be instructed to report the resolution back to the Senate not later than Thursday, December 21, 1950.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senators who favor the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] will vote "yea" when their names are called; those opposed to the amendment will vote "nay."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri require the Committee on Foreign Relations to report to the Senate by Thursday of this week, or Thursday of next week?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee would be required to report to the Senate not later than Thursday, December 21, 1950. That is this week.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment. It is a very important amendment. The resolution is very important. The Committee on Foreign Relations should not be pushed with such rapidity. Probably it would involve some hearings to dispose of the resolution. No doubt witnesses would have to be called from the State Department. It seems to me it is very short notice, and I hope the Senate will vote down the amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I very earnestly urge Senators to vote against the amendment. The Senate is busy with the tax bill, and we have other important matters before us. Members of the Committee on Foreign Relations are also members of other committees which require their attendance at hearings. The resolution is a very important one. The Senator from Missouri would give the committee directions not only what it should do but when it should do it. The Senator's amendment would force the committee to report to the Senate by December 21, which will be next Thursday. I appeal to Senators to vote down the amendment to the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered. Those who favor the amendment offered by the Sen-

ator from Missouri to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] will vote "yea" when their names are called; those who oppose the motion will vote "nay." The Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I announce also that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay," and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

I announce further that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is unavoidably detained on official business, and if present would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business, and if present and voting would vote "yea."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPPEL] who is detained on official business is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation, and if present would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 45, as follows:

## YEAS—30

Aiken	Ives	Mundt
Brewster	Jenner	Nixon
Butler	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Knowland	Taft
Cordon	Langer	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Ecton	Martin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Millikin	Williams
Hickenlooper	Morse	Young

## NAYS—45

Anderson	Holland	Magnuson
Chapman	Hunt	Maybank
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Murray
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Douglas	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Leahy	Pepper
Ellender	Lehman	Robertson
Frear	Long	Russell
Fulbright	Lucas	Saltonstall
George	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Gurney	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hayden	McFarland	Stennis
Hill	McKellar	Taylor
Hoey	McMahon	Tydings

## NOT VOTING—21

Benton	Flanders	Myers
Bricker	Gillette	Schoeppel
Bridges	Green	Sparkman
Byrd	Humphrey	Thomas, Okla.
Cain	Kefauver	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	Kilgore	Tobey
Ferguson	Lodge	Vandenberg

So Mr. KEM's amendment to Mr. CONNALLY's motion was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to refer Senate Resolution 371 to the Committee on Foreign Relations. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are unavoidably detained on official business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business as a representative of the United States to the fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

I announce further that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is unavoidably detained on official business and if present would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is absent by leave of the Senate

on official business, having been appointed as a delegate from the Senate to attend the meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association in Australia.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] would vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent on official business, and if present would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Kansas would each vote "nay."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is detained on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation and if present would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 29, as follows:

## YEAS—47

Anderson	Hunt	Murray
Chapman	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Connally	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Leahy	Pepper
Eastland	Lehman	Robertson
Ellender	Long	Russell
Frear	Lucas	Saltonstall
Fulbright	McCarran	Smith, Maine
George	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Gurney	McFarland	Stennis
Hayden	McKellar	Taylor
Hill	McMahon	Thomas, Utah
Hoey	Magnuson	Tydings
Holland	Maybank	

## NAYS—29

Aiken	Jenner	Nixon
Brewster	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Knowland	Taft
Cordon	Langer	Thye
Donnell	McCarthy	Watkins
Dworshak	Malone	Wherry
Ecton	Martin	Wiley
Hendrickson	Millikin	Williams
Hickenlooper	Morse	Young
Ives	Mundt	

## NOT VOTING—20

Benton	Ferguson	Lodge
Bricker	Flanders	Schoeppel
Bridges	Gillette	Sparkman
Butler	Green	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Humphrey	Tobey
Cain	Kefauver	Vandenberg
Capehart	Kilgore	

So Mr. CONNALLY's motion was agreed to, and the resolution (S. Res. 371) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## REPUBLICAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO OUR SECURITY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, first I should like to pay a tribute to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEL-LAR] for the remarks he made a moment ago, and I should like to associate myself with the sentiments he so eloquently expressed. I was very much impressed by the statement made by the senior Member of this body, and I think everyone will take his remarks to heart.

Mr. President, on Saturday last, the day after the Republicans of this Congress formally condemned the Secretary of State and demanded his dismissal, the

New York Times reported on the front page as follows:

The consensus of comment reported in a London dispatch was that the Republican action had struck a severe blow against the leadership of the United States in European action for defense.

As everyone knows, Mr. Acheson was scheduled to leave, and did leave, on Sunday to attend an extremely important conference in Brussels. The purpose of this conference is to coordinate our efforts and plans with those of our allies in the North Atlantic Treaty organization. Our allies, in fact all free peoples, are looking to this Nation for leadership in our common struggle against the ever-increasing pressure of Russian aggression.

Critical decisions of far-reaching importance concerning the creation of a European defense system, the integration of national military forces, and the coordination of economic resources, must be made. This condemnation of the Secretary of State, our representative at the conference, will largely, if not completely, destroy his influence, and consequently, our Nation's influence at this conference. Certainly this action has caused confusion and uncertainty in the minds of our allies. It is a most serious matter that at a time like this we find ourselves without an effective way to counsel with our friends or to use our influence in building the united defenses of the free world, including our own. I can think of no greater tragedy to a great nation than to find itself unable to make decisions and to act in the moment of its greatest danger.

Mr. President, this attack upon Mr. Acheson is, of course, not just a personal matter between him and the Republicans. It is, in fact, an attack upon the President and his foreign policy, and will be so interpreted by the world. Everyone knows that the President, under our Constitution, has the primary responsibility for our foreign policy. Everyone knows that Mr. Acheson is not an independent agent, but, on the contrary, that he is but the instrumentality of the President in carrying into effect the foreign policy which the President determines.

Mr. President, if the Republicans desire to change our foreign policy, which I assume they do, I submit that they have approached their objective in a misguided and irresponsible manner, unworthy of a great party. Instead of a personal attack upon an individual, let them come forward with a constructive foreign policy program. They have many persuasive advocates among their members; and if their program has substance and merit, surely they can rely upon the membership of this body and the people to give their suggestions serious and sympathetic consideration. If they can persuade the majority of this body and the people that their substantive proposals are right, I have no doubt the President will modify his policies accordingly, just as this body will listen sympathetically to their proposals. This



procedure is in accord with our free democratic traditions, and would, I believe, receive universal approval.

On the contrary, Mr. President, the persistence of the Republicans in pursuing a policy of character assassination as a means of bringing about changes in our policies or our Government is an extremely dangerous course to follow. It smacks of Nazi totalitarianism. It is based upon an appeal to the prejudices and emotions of men, rather than to reason. It can, if carried on, cause disruption among our allies and division among our own people.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Arkansas keeps referring to the Republicans. I think perhaps he should say—if I may make a slight correction—a majority of the Republicans.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I accept that correction. Of course the Members of this body know to whom I am referring. The action taken was the official action, as I understand, of the majority of the conference of the Republican Members of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. President, for more than a year now we have witnessed in this country an unparalleled campaign of personal vilification, irresponsible and unrestrained. The latest object of this campaign, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, occupied many hours of the time of the Committee on the Armed Services, at a period when those men should have been giving their concentrated, profound, and undivided attention to the security of this Nation. I refer to the last 2 weeks. I cannot think of any more effective way by which our efforts to provide for our security could be sabotaged than to distract the best minds, the leaders of this Congress, the Members of our Armed Services Committee, by such false charges. I do not believe the evil geniuses of the Kremlin can devise a more effective way to paralyze us than to induce our leaders, in the Congress and in the executive branch of our Government, to spend their time and energies in a frenzied examination of false charges against our own citizens. If a stranger from Mars should read our press during the past year, it probably would never occur to him that the real enemies of this country are in Moscow, rather than Washington.

Mr. President, I do not for a minute wish to leave the impression that I think our foreign policy has been flawless or that constructive criticism should be withheld by the opposition. I, for one, welcome temperate and pertinent advice and suggestions as to what is the proper course for us to pursue. My point is simply that to attack the patriotism and character of persons with whom one may disagree, rather than the ideas and policies involved, is unjustifiable and irresponsible, and dangerous to our security.

Mr. President, I appeal to the thoughtful and responsible members of the mi-

nority party to reflect that, in this dangerous period, with the majority, as small as it is—and as small as it will be in the next Congress—the administration, as never before needs their sympathetic support. I am confident that the people of this country will, during the next 2 years, recognize and appreciate the contribution to our security that the minority may make. Working together, I am sure we can prevail against the ruthless aggression of Russia. Divided and suspicious of one another, no one can predict what may happen.

Suspicion and hatred and distrust have a way of spreading like a plague. Once they are aroused, they are not easy to eradicate. If the infection spreads too far and too deep, such confusion and distrust may increase to such an extent that only a man on horseback can control the situation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator wish me to yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thought the Senator had completed his remarks, and I wanted to make some observations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas yields the floor. The Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, it is not my intention to prolong the discussion which has been advanced by the Senator from Arkansas. I merely wish to point out, however, that during the Republican Eightieth Congress the Senate and Members of the Senate on this side of the aisle gave overwhelming support to the foreign policy of our country. It was under the leadership of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] that the Greek-Turkish aid program, and the ECA program got under way. When the North Atlantic Pact was before this body, it had the overwhelming support of Members on both sides of the aisle. The arms implementation legislation, each time it has been before this session and the previous session, has had the overwhelming support of Members on both sides of the aisle.

I believe that the Senator from Arkansas is mistaken when he tries to make the point that the resolution which was adopted by both the minority Members of the House and of the Senate, was directed to the personality of the individual concerned. I believe that Mr. Acheson unfortunately may find himself in a situation somewhat parallel to that in which the former Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Chamberlain, found himself at the outbreak of World War II. It will be recalled that Mr. Chamberlain had participated in the Munich conference.

I have no doubt now, and have never had any doubt, that Mr. Chamberlain sincerely believed that by appeasing the Nazis at Munich, he was gaining some time. He at that time perhaps did not believe Hitler would violate his agreements, and that appeasement, then as now, was but surrender on the installment plan. But with the benefit of the retrospect of history, we know that appeasement is not the road to peace.

Many of us on this side of the aisle have supported the foreign policy of this Government in Europe because we have felt that that policy made sense. It was to enable the rehabilitation of war-torn Europe so that a vacuum would not be created into which would flow the forces of international communism. I think all Americans, regardless of partisan affiliation, recognized the fact, after a short time, that economic assistance alone would not solve the problem, because the Soviet Government and international communism are determined to press for any soft spot. Therefore, when the President of the United States proposed a Greek-Turkish-aid program to withstand that type of pressure, not only with economic help but with military aid, that program—and I cite the record, and I challenge the Senator from Arkansas to dispute it—had the overwhelming support of Members on this side of the aisle as well as on the other side of the aisle. No party has any monopoly on patriotism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall yield in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield at the conclusion of my remarks. The oath which the Members on this side of the aisle took to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States is no less sacred than that which was taken by Members on the other side of the aisle; and while we may have honest differences of opinion, I think that, however we vote, it is in the belief that we are serving our country to the best of our ability.

When we found that the pressures of international communism still persisted after the Berlin blockade, the North Atlantic Pact was proposed to the Senate of the United States. It had the overwhelming support of Republicans and Democrats alike. That was followed by the arms-implementation legislation as I have pointed out heretofore, which also had the overwhelming support of Republicans and Democrats alike.

I have pointed out that I think Mr. Acheson, perhaps unfortunately, found himself in the same position as that in which Mr. Chamberlain found himself after Munich. When finally the pressure by Germany became so great and Hitler violated the Munich agreement, Mr. Chamberlain brought Great Britain into the war when Germany attacked Poland. He recognized that his past policies had been a mistake, and that it was impossible to yield to appeasement and save the peace. He faced up to the problem. But I think it was apparent to everyone at that point that he was a captive of his past mistakes, and that Britain could not have had the unity which she needed in her most desperate hour, under the leadership of Mr. Chamberlain. Chamberlain had to give way for Winston Churchill, and, under Mr. Churchill,

Britain obtained the degree of unity which she needed in that period.

In speaking on this question I do not claim to speak for the Republican Party, but only for myself.

As I have said, I think Mr. Acheson found himself in somewhat the same position as that of Mr. Chamberlain. It is true that Mr. Acheson was advancing a program to stop communism in Europe. That program, as I have pointed out, had the overwhelming support of both parties in the Congress. But, while he was closing the door to communism in Europe, his policies were leaving a door wide open to communism in Asia. It is on this basis that I believe there has been a strong feeling, not only in the Congress but throughout the country, that those policies were unsound for, certainly, if 1,500,000,000 people should fall into the orbit of international communism, with the vast resources of Asia, such as oil, tin, and rubber, to say nothing of the great supplies of manpower, there are some of us who honestly believe that it would be most difficult, if not impossible, to stop communism in Europe under those conditions.

Mr. President, I think we should face some of the alternatives. I have never been one of those who have maintained that we should turn our eyes to Asia alone. To the contrary, I think many of us on this side of the aisle recognize the tremendous importance of Europe, and that we must give to Europe a larger share of whatever help we can give; but our complaint has been that the State Department has underestimated the importance of Asia. Those who contend that it is possible to concentrate attention on Europe, and that at all hazards, we should risk an abject surrender if need be in Asia, in order to concentrate on Europe, are furthering a very dangerous doctrine; because, if in a far eastern Munich we are prepared to yield in Korea and in Formosa, how are we going to withstand the pressures of communism in Japan? And, if we yield in Japan, we turn over to international communism a great industrial potential second only to the Ruhr?

If we yield then in Japan, how shall we maintain a position in the Philippines? Because all the arguments which can be made about abandoning Asia insofar as Formosa and Korea are concerned, or subsequently, Japan, can be made about the danger of becoming embroiled in a situation in the Philippines. If we are prepared to surrender in the Philippines, how can we withstand communism anywhere in southeast Asia? If we are prepared to yield and surrender in southeast Asia, how can we convince the American people that we should stand in India or in Pakistan? I think the American people and Senators of the United States on both sides of the aisle are entitled to an answer from the administration as to where it is proposed to stand. Is it proposed that we shall constantly yield, until all of Asia goes, and there is such overwhelming power in the Communist orbit that it will overwhelm anything we are able to build up in Europe. It has been estimated that the Soviet Union has in Siberia about

750,000 of their troops. If they are able to protect their far-eastern flank, they will be able to transfer those troops, as Mr. Stalin did during the attacks on Moscow and Leningrad, from the Far East into Europe. That number alone is greater than the total number of troops we are talking about equipping and supplying in Western Europe to meet the onslaught of communism.

There is grave danger, many of us believe, in letting Asia go down the drain. That is the point on which some of us have differed from the foreign policy of the administration. There would have been no Korean situation, I believe, had there not been a Communist China. There would be no danger today in southeast Asia if communism had not reached the borders of Indochina. There would be no threat in Japan today if it were not for the overwhelming victory of communism in China, largely with the support of the Soviet Union at a time when the Government of the United States was turning its back on the Republic of China.

These things are a part of the history of the situation. The fact that the State Department tried to encourage a coalition with communism in China is so clear that no one can successfully dispute it. History has taught us that we cannot have coalitions with communism. It did not work in Poland, where the democratic leaders were forced to flee. It did not work in Czechoslovakia where Mazaryk's life was forfeited. It did not work in Bulgaria, where the democratic leader, Fetkov, was hanged. It did not and it does not work at any other place in the world, and there is no reason to believe it would work any better in Asia than it did in Europe.

I should like to say to the able Senator from Arkansas that if a policy is devised which warrants the support of the American people, a global policy to meet a global menace, there is no question of doubt in my mind that it will receive the overwhelming support of Republicans and Democrats alike. But I do not believe we would be discharging our obligations as Senators of the United States to be rubber stamps for either the present administration or any future Republican or Democratic administration. We have an obligation which we cannot lightly put aside.

The American people are entitled to the facts and to the truth. I have confidence that if the people know the facts, they will make sound judgments. But they have not always had the facts from this administration. For a period of 2 years the Wedemeyer report on China, which would have given information to the Congress and to the American people, which might have helped us make sound judgments, was suppressed and was denied to the American people. The Wedemeyer report on Korea has been suppressed for 3 years, and is today still suppressed.

I say, on my responsibility, as a Senator of the United States, as one of the few Senators who have had the opportunity to read that report, that, in my judgment, though I am not at liberty to disclose its contents because it is still maintained in the security classification,

there is nothing in that report which, if it had been released to the American people and to the Congress, would have been detrimental to the security of the people of the United States. On the contrary, it would have put the Congress and the country on notice of some of the grave dangers involved in withdrawing our troops from Korea, or if we were to withdraw our troops from Korea, it would have put us on notice that the army of the Republic of Korea should have been better equipped than it was finally equipped by this Government when we did withdraw.

In the face of that record, in the face of the secret agreement at Yalta by which we lost the moral leadership of the world when we surrendered to the Soviet Union something which was not ours to surrender, when it was done without the consent of the American people or of the American Congress, when we took what belonged to our wartime ally and friend, the Republic of China, and gave it to the Soviet Union, and, by so doing, assured Russian domination of Manchuria—I say we lost our moral leadership in the world. In the face of that record, there is room for criticism of the foreign policy of this Nation insofar as it relates to us.

When we consider the fact that in 1939 there were only 175,000,000 people within the orbit of Soviet imperialism, and when today there are more than 800,000,000 behind the Communist iron curtain, I say we do have a right to question the measure of success of our foreign policy.

Mr. President, speaking merely on my own responsibility as a Senator of the United States, I believe we would be derelict in our duty if we did not bring some of these things to the attention of the people of the United States. I stand ready today, as I have always stood ready, to support the Government of the United States in a sound foreign program. I have voted, without exception, for every proposal which has been presented, insofar as Europe is concerned, and I have parted company only when the administration tried to force a coalition with communism in Asia and when it failed to recognize the great danger to the United States of having a billion and a half persons in Asia fall into the arms of international communism.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to make a few observations, if the Senator from California has yielded the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from California stated that he was not present when I started my remarks. I did not intend in this speech to analyze the whole substance of our foreign policy. My particular point was with reference to the criticism by the Republicans of the Secretary of State, and I should like to make a few observations on that point.

I desire to try to straighten out the record a little bit, because I feel that the remarks of the Senator from California have slanted the entire discussion in a direction which I had not intended. There was nothing in my remarks questioning the patriotism of those who criticize or demand the resignation of the



Secretary of State. I question their wisdom, especially at this time, and the appropriateness of the nature of the attack upon the Secretary. I want to point out that in our Government the Secretary of State does not play the same role as that played in England by the Prime Minister. The Secretary of State is not in the same position as that which was occupied by Mr. Chamberlain or any Prime Minister under a parliamentary system. The Secretary is the agent of the President not of the Congress. The President is comparable to the Prime Minister, but his tenure is not subject to a vote of confidence by the Congress.

In regard to the support of our foreign policy, I am disturbed by the present situation, in view of the fact the Republicans overwhelmingly supported our foreign policy a year ago. That leads me to the feeling that this attack has been based upon a false foundation. It is the same type of thing which was inspired and led by certain members of the minority party more than a year ago, which has put the relationship between the members of this body on a false and dangerous basis. I refer to the questioning of men's motives and questioning their patriotism, instead of questioning the wisdom of their policies. If the Senator's party had confined its criticism to the type of criticism which the Senator from California made in his address a moment ago, that is, questioning the wisdom of our policies, they would have every right to do so. I have great sympathy for such an approach. In fact, I welcome some constructive suggestion as to what we ought to do now.

It is true that the Senator from California and I have a different view about what happened in China. He interprets the widely publicized offer or suggestion by General Marshall that the Nationalist Government seek some kind of coalition with the Communists as an act of appeasement. I feel that there was a great weakness in the administration of Chiang Kai-shek, and that even at that time the situation was hopeless insofar as we were concerned. Furthermore, it was felt the only way to handle the situation would be to send in a full-scale army with all its equipment, and thus undertake the subjection of China. However, I firmly believe that General Marshall and our other leaders felt that in their best judgment it was a hopeless situation. Doubtless they felt that the corruption and reaction of the old Koumintang party was such that it was helpless in the struggle against the Communists.

That, however, is another phase of the problem. I am willing to discuss it, and I hope we shall have an opportunity when we can very dispassionately discuss the entire subject on its merits.

I wish to impress my point on the Senator from California and other Senators. I was questioning the wisdom of the action taken on Friday by the Republicans which may, and probably will, destroy the influence of our country in the councils of our Allies and before the world at this very critical time. The plea I was making, and which I am still making, is that at least during this critical period we act calmly and not fall to quarreling among ourselves about the

patriotism of personalities who are involved in our Government. That is the main point I was seeking to make.

I was not seeking to defend every item of our foreign policy. I remind the Senator that I have had very serious differences of view with the Secretary of State. I think the Senator will recall that on ECA legislation year after year for 3 years I offered amendments of which he did not approve, and which the majority of the Senate did not support. I could refer to several such items. I do not think that our foreign policy is faultless. However, I am convinced that under present circumstances that the kind of attack to which I have referred will prove to have been a disservice to our country, to the Republican Party, and to our democratic system of government.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to yield the floor. The Senator from Colorado has been very patient. However, I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator from Arkansas stated that the only way in which we could deal with the matter would be to proceed to defeat or impeach the President. Does the Senator recall the statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I said that if the objective is to change our foreign policy and our administration of it, it is the President and not the Secretary of State who determines the policy. The President is the equivalent of Mr. Chamberlain. If the Senator from California wishes to change our policy, it is up to the President, and not Mr. Acheson, who after all is a subordinate and subject to dismissal and control by the President.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does the Senator from Arkansas recognize the provision in the Constitution with reference to the conduct of our foreign policy with the advice and consent of the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. As to appointments and treaties, not as to the formulation of policies.

Mr. BREWSTER. Does not the Senator believe that the formulation of treaties and the appointment of personnel are matters peculiarly within the advice and consent of the Senate?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that the North Atlantic treaty, which he is seeking to implement at Brussels, was submitted to the Senate, and a majority of the Senate supported the treaty. I think it will be found that a majority of the Republican Members of the Senate have supported other major items.

Mr. BREWSTER. I understood the Senator from California to state that the North Atlantic treaty is a perfect example of a subject involving the advice and consent of the Senate. It must be remembered that its initiation came during the Eightieth Congress, when the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] presented his resolution with respect to it. Is that not correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe the origin of it was the resolution called the Vandenberg resolution, if I recall correctly.

Mr. BREWSTER. That is correct. As the Senator from California has

pointed out, does not the Senator recognize that in the recent election the conduct of our foreign policy by Mr. Acheson was one of the major issues in the campaign?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It was my impression that it was not the conduct of our foreign policy. Rather, I believe it was the character, the patriotism, and the allegiance of certain individuals to our form of government, which is the very thing I am seeking to criticize. In my opinion, such criticism is an appeal to emotions and prejudices, and not to reason. Criticism has been made on that basis, and not upon a reasonable or rational examination of the policy involved. While we had none of it in my own State, from what I have been told there was that kind of criticism in other States. It seems to me that it may be excusable for the Republican Party immediately before the election to go much further in its criticisms than it should go now when the election is over and we are confronted with a grave emergency. Certainly now, we ought to go very far in trying to get away from that type of approach to the problem.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator from Arkansas question the fact that certainly following the election it was generally considered that the results of the election indicated serious question in the minds of the people with respect to the conduct of our foreign policy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that it may have well been influenced by its course; that is, whether we were doing well or not in Korea. However, I recall when the authorization to move our troops into Korea was announced it resulted in very hearty support from Republicans as well as Democrats. I believe one active Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Relations even proposed some kind of resolution endorsing our action in Korea. It is true that when reverses set in and the consequences became apparent, there was a change in sentiment. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. BREWSTER. I have one other question to ask of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. Does he not recognize that while the Senator from Maine would have deferred action a little longer—and, in fact, tried very earnestly to defer action—with the honest expectation that the President of the United States himself would recognize the significance of the election and the lack of confidence that seemed to be implied in the result, the Republican membership of this body had shown great moderation in waiting more than a month since the election, anticipating, as many others did, that it would mean a change in the position taken, and that it was not, apparently, until there were other definite moves made to cloak over past errors and to build up a position of carrying on with the guidance of a leader in politics which had so tragically failed, that this action finally came? Does the Senator not recognize the moderation of the Republicans in most instances, and would he not accord to us that position which I am sure we accord to him, of complete sincerity in seeking the welfare of our country? I do not believe that the misguided words of one or another in an

election should be attributed to everyone concerned, particularly when we have waited a whole month before taking the action which the Senator now questions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to impress upon the Senator that I tried very carefully to refrain, and did refrain, from questioning the motives or patriotism or character of the Republicans. It is purely a question of the wisdom and timing of the statement. It is a question of the wisdom of the statement, with regard to our own effectiveness in this time of trouble. That is the distinction which I wish to impress, and that is the very distinction which I was hoping the Republican Members of both bodies would make.

It is time we quit attacking other men's motives when we disagree with their ideas. We should attack only the ideas. That is exactly the essence of the plea which I am trying to make today. The time has long passed when, every time we disagree with someone, we call him a Communist. We may say that he is stupid or that he is wrong. I take no offense at that.

The Senator knows what I am talking about. To me the experience of Anna Rosenberg was a dreadful thing. Apparently all one needs to do is to have some crackpot point a finger at someone, and the whole country is stirred into a frenzy. That is the kind of thing which I think is dangerous. If we can agree to disagree only on the level of ideas or policies, then I think there will be no trouble.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator from Arkansas challenge the proposition that a very substantial majority of the membership on the other side of the aisle have privately and repeatedly expressed the opinion to their colleagues in this body that a change in the office of Secretary of State is now wise and desirable?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is true.

Mr. BREWSTER. That, it seems to me, tells the whole story.

(The following debate, which appears at page 16896 of the daily RECORD of Tuesday, December 19, 1950, was, on request of Mr. FULBRIGHT, and by unanimous consent, ordered to be transposed and to be printed at this point in the permanent RECORD of Monday, December 18, 1950.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, yesterday after I had made my statement about the Republican action on Friday demanding the dismissal of the Secretary of State, the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] asked me some questions and engaged me in debate. The Senator from Maine is an exceedingly clever man. His mind works like radar, and his tongue like lightning.

At one point in the debate, in answer to one of his interrogatories, I misinterpreted the significance of his statement, and my answer was not in accord with what I believed then, and now believe, to be the facts.

I do not believe that a majority of the Democratic Members of this body be-

lieve that the Secretary of State should be dismissed now, especially under the circumstances which the Republican Party created by its action on Friday. Certainly at that time I had no way of even estimating such a fact. I sought to correct my answer to read:

I think that is true on the other side of the aisle, but it is not true on this side of the aisle.

That expresses more accurately what I believe to be the real facts. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be transposed in the permanent RECORD so as to follow immediately my answer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to be clear as to whether or not the context originally appearing in the RECORD is to remain?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The context as it appears in the RECORD is to remain, because the Senator well knows that he objected to any change. I am only asking that the explanation I have now made be transposed in the permanent RECORD to follow my answer on that page. I do not see how the Senator could object to that.

Mr. BREWSTER. I should like to have inserted in connection therewith, also at the same point in the RECORD, this additional material, which it seems to me has a very pertinent bearing upon the question. With all deference to the intentions of the Senator from Arkansas, I think his record as a public speaker and as a debater, and his long training, are sufficiently familiar to my colleagues.

The question which I asked was—and it was in connection with a colloquy which was under way, and certainly in respect to which there was no possibility of misinterpretation:

Mr. BREWSTER. Would the Senator from Arkansas challenge the proposition that a very substantial majority of the membership on the other side of the aisle have privately and repeatedly expressed the opinion to their colleagues in this body that a change in the office of Secretary of State is now wise and desirable?

The answer appears in the RECORD, and, as I understand, the Senator from Arkansas does not challenge it:

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is true.

This further colloquy followed then:

Mr. BREWSTER. That, it seems to me, tells the whole story.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that many of the Senator's colleagues have gone far beyond that, and have indulged in exactly the sort of thing which I think both of us deplore; that is insinuation as to motives, and the insinuation that whatever failures there have been—and there is disagreement as to how effective our policy has been—resulted not purely from lack of wisdom, but from insincerity or from a lack of patriotism. That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Now it seems to me that what the majority leader [Mr. LUCAS] had to say is very clear confirmation.

Mr. LUCAS. One point which the Senator has been making is with respect to the question of timing.

I am quoting from the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS].

It seems to me that is the most important point we are debating.

I may have been misinformed with respect to the Senator from Maine. If I have been correctly informed I wish to congratulate him. He can say yes or no, as to whether or not he did what has been reported to me. It is my understanding that in the conference of Republicans the Senator from Maine pleaded with his colleagues not to do what they have done, but seek an opportunity to sit down with Republicans and Democrats alike, together with the President of the United States, to see whether or not this project could not be moved along in the direction which the majority of Republicans desired. However, he was overruled. That is the story I heard. Whether it is true or false I do not know. But if it be true, I wish to commend the Senator if he took that position in the conference.

I skip three or four lines in which he challenged the action of the Republicans. I think I will not skip it. I will read it.

I feel that the Senator from Arkansas is entirely right. It seems to me unbelievable that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle should take this action on the eve of Mr. Acheson's departure for Brussels. If they had taken it 10 days ago, 2 weeks ago, or after his return, that would be something else. But in my humble opinion my Republican friends have practically destroyed his usefulness at that conference as a result of the action which they took.

Farther along, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] added:

It seems unbelievable that men in the United States Senate should take the action which was taken in tying the hands of the Secretary of State when he goes to a conference dealing with problems which may shake the foundations of the world within the next few days.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] allowed me again to interrupt him, which I very much appreciated, and it will be found that I replied to the Senator from Illinois saying it was quite true that I had sought to accomplish the objective which many Members on both sides had in view, namely, a change.

Then I said:

About 2 weeks ago the Senator from Maine consulted what might be considered his opposite number on the other side with a view to such action. He found complete concurrence. The Senator from Arkansas has frankly admitted that there are many on the other side who feel that there should be a change.

Similarly, my views were presented to some of the executive departments and discussions were opened as to whether four or five Members on this side of the aisle and four or five Members on the other side might sit down with the President and explain to him why it seemed desirable for this result to be brought about.

No further reply has been received from the other side.

It was felt that the President himself, if he were properly advised by Members on the other side of the aisle, would immediately recognize the need for a change.

I omitted one sentence which follows something I read previously:

No further reply has been received from the other side. In spite of that, not only the Senator from Maine, but many other Senators on this side who have varying views, and some very intense views, sought to delay



action when the Ives proposal was first made, with a view to some possible accommodation.

That is the reason why we drifted along until we were on the very eve of Mr. Acheson's departure. I was one of those most reluctant to act. However, I believe that the necessity for facing this issue was the result of the failure to recognize the implications of the election, and the very frank and candid admission by the Senator from Arkansas, which does credit to his honesty of purpose, that there were perhaps a majority on the other side who felt the wisdom of a change. If a change had been brought about at any time within the past month, this whole tragic situation could have been avoided. But it is not possible in view of the feeling in the country.

I have stated the reasons why those of us who have sought to defer this action found ourselves in a more and more untenable position. So it certainly does not seem to me that those on this side can be challenged for having finally felt that they must thus express their convictions that recent conditions demanded there be a change.

There it seems to me, if the Senator from Arkansas will permit, to be perfectly clear that throughout the whole colloquy it was entirely evident, and it proceeded upon the assumption, that a majority upon the other side of the aisle—and I think there is no question as to what "the other side of the aisle" means, as I was certainly speaking from this side of the aisle—felt privately that there should be a change.

I do not want to challenge the right or the propriety of the Senator from Arkansas expressing himself now as to what he may have meant, but I cannot conceive that in the entire colloquy of the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Arkansas there was any possibility for misunderstanding as to what we all had very definitely in mind.

I would simply ask that in whatever interpolation is made by the Senator from Arkansas, that my remarks similarly may be included following his in the interpolation in the permanent RECORD.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to include in my unanimous-consent request whatever the Senator from Maine wishes to put in. The only point of my request is to clarify the RECORD. From my point of view, and, I think, as we all admit, the Senator from Maine is the cleverest man in the Senate in debate. He has the quickest mind, and so forth. I am simply stating, for whatever it may be worth to the Senate and the public, that his response does not represent my belief at that time or now, and that it was his words which were put into a form of a challenge by the Senator from Maine. He said, "the other side of the aisle." Now, to me in that kind of debate "the other side of the aisle" meant the Republican side. It was the side I had been discussing, I thought, for some several minutes. It was the action of the Republicans which I was deploring. And that is "the other side of the aisle." What I sought to do in correcting the RECORD last night was to say "that is true on the other side of the aisle, but not on this side." The Senator from Maine took exception to that correction. Therefore there has to be this explanation.

Now certainly, as to my unanimous-consent request, I am perfectly willing for the Senator from Maine to interpret it in any way he likes. I am only stating as a fact that I did not intend at that time, nor now, to say that the majority of the Members on this side, the Democratic side, wish to have the Secretary of State dismissed. To my knowledge only one person that I know of has publicly made such a statement on the Democratic side of the aisle. As to what the others have privately said, I am not here to speak for them now or any other time. That is all I want to do in the RECORD, and I am perfectly willing to include in my request that at this point in the RECORD, this explanation of mine, and whatever the Senator from Maine chooses to say, as he has, be put into the RECORD in order that whoever reads the RECORD will have the matter drawn to his attention.

If it is not transposed in the permanent RECORD, there will be nothing to indicate what my real opinion is. That is all I wish to have done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me inquire whether it will also appear that this was interpolated on the following day.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think that is quite proper. I simply wish the facts to appear in the permanent RECORD as they are. As I understand, the Official Reporters often do that in the permanent RECORD, namely, transpose some colloquy which relates to a former occasion.

Mr. BREWSTER. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection whatever.

I wish to express my appreciation of the very generous compliment of the Senator from Arkansas. In view of the extensive training the Senator from Arkansas had in his Rhodes Scholar days and as president of a great university, I think he is quite capable of taking care of himself on the floor of the Senate, and I think that his earlier frank statement—

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I call for the regular order. The world is on fire. Continuation of the present out-of-order debate would simply tend to add fuel to the flames.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I had reserved the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. When the regular order is called for, all previous reservations lapse.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator will not object to permitting me to conclude my statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia withdraw his demand for the regular order?

Mr. NEELY. No, Mr. President; I insist upon it.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The unfinished business is the conference report on the slot-machine bill.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I simply wish to take a minute or two of the time of the Senate to make it perfectly clear that in no way did the Senator from Illinois agree on yesterday, in the course of the debate and colloquy between the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Maine, that the majority, the Democrats on this side of the aisle, agreed that Secretary Acheson should resign or that the President should call for his resignation. The implication left by the statement made by the Senator from Maine is, I think, to that effect; and I wish to deny any such implication and deny that I made any such charge either directly or indirectly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Arkansas that the debate which has just taken place be transposed so as to appear in the permanent RECORD at the place indicated in yesterday's RECORD is agreed to.

(Following the above transposition, the debate on Monday, September 18, 1950, continued as follows.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that many of the Senator's colleagues have gone far beyond that, and have indulged in exactly the sort of thing which I think both of us deplore: that is insinuation as to motives, and the insinuation that whatever failures there have been—and there is disagreement as to how effective our policy has been—resulted not purely from lack of wisdom, but from insincerity or from a lack of patriotism. That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. One point which the Senator has been making is with respect to the question of timing. It seems to me that that is the most important point we are debating.

I may have been misinformed with respect to the Senator from Maine. If I have been correctly informed I wish to congratulate him. He can say yes or no, as to whether or not he did what has been reported to me. It is my understanding that in the conference of Republicans the Senator from Maine pleaded with his colleagues not to do what they have done, but seek an opportunity to sit down with Republicans and Democrats alike, together with the President of the United States, to see whether or not this project could not be moved along in the direction which the majority of Republicans desired. However, he was overruled. That is the story I heard. Whether it is true or false I do not know. But if it be true, I wish to commend the Senator if he took that position in the conference.

I feel that the Senator from Arkansas is entirely right. It seems to me unbelievable that my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle should take this action on the eve of Mr. Acheson's departure for Brussels. If they had taken it 10 days ago, 2 weeks ago, or after his return, that would be something else. But in my humble opinion my Republi-

can friends have practically destroyed his usefulness at that conference as a result of the action which they took. Because of the tension which exists throughout the world, it seems to me that that conference is probably the most important conference the Secretary of State has attended in connection with foreign affairs since he has held that office.

Almost every article we read is along the same line, whether we read Mr. James in the New York Times, Arthur Krock, the editorials in the Washington Star or Post, or the editorials from the Herald Tribune which have been placed in the RECORD by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

A cartoon from the front page of the Washington Star of yesterday shows Acheson boarding a plane with his hands tied behind his back with a rope. Mr. President, that tells it all. In my opinion those who operate the Washington Evening Star are absolutely on the square so far as their independence is concerned, and so far as the treatment of a problem is concerned. The cartoon and the editorial from the Star tell the story.

Mr. President, I am not making a plea for Acheson so much as I am making a plea for my country. As I stated on the floor of the Senate the other day, in my judgment this is the most critical period in the history of this Republic. It seems unbelievable that men in the United States Senate should take the action which was taken in tying the hands of the Secretary of State when he goes to a conference dealing with problems which may shake the foundations of the world within the next few days. I say definitely that in my opinion such action has weakened the position of our Secretary of State. There can be no question about it. My friends knew that he was leaving at this particular time. So I say that in my opinion the timing is very, very bad.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President—  
Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor. I wished to make one further observation. Does the Senator from Maine desire to have me yield to him? The Senator from Oregon has been on his feet. Does he wish me to yield to him, or does he desire the floor in his own right?

Mr. MORSE. I should like to have the Senator yield for a question, but I yield to my friend from Maine if he has a question.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I desire to reply as soon as I may to what the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] has said.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. BREWSTER. It is quite true that the Senator from Maine has sought to accomplish the objective which many Members on both sides had in view, namely, a change. However, the Senator from Maine has found himself in a very unhappy position. This action has been held off for more than a month since the election. About 2 weeks ago the Senator from Maine consulted what might be considered his opposite number

on the other side with a view to such action. He found complete concurrence. The Senator from Arkansas has frankly admitted that there are many on the other side who feel that there should be a change.

Similarly, my views were presented to some of the executive departments and discussions were opened as to whether four or five Members on this side of the aisle and four or five Members on the other side might sit down with the President and explain to him why it seemed desirable for this result to be brought about.

No further reply has been received from the other side. In spite of that, not only the Senator from Maine, but many other Senators on this side who have varying views, and some very intense views, sought to delay action when the Ives proposal was first made, with a view to some possible accommodation. It was felt that the President himself, if he were properly advised by Members on the other side of the aisle, would immediately recognize the need for a change. That is the reason why we drifted along until we were on the very eve of Mr. Acheson's departure. I was one of those most reluctant to act. However, I believe that the necessity for facing this issue was the result of the failure to recognize the implications of the election, and the very frank and candid admission by the Senator from Arkansas, which does credit to his honesty of purpose, that there were perhaps a majority on the other side who felt the wisdom of a change. If a change had been brought about at any time within the past month, this whole tragic situation could have been avoided. But it is not possible in view of the feeling in the country.

The appearance of the Secretary of State during his broadcast was tragic in the extreme. What is the explanation for it? It is beyond me. Everyone who saw it was shocked and horrified, not so much at the content of the broadcast, which did not commend itself, but at the appearance and delivery, which seemed to be that of a man who had completely lost his grasp, his courage, and his leadership. I have stated the reasons why those of us who have sought to defer this action found ourselves in a more and more untenable position. So it certainly does not seem to me that those on this side can be challenged for having finally felt that they must thus express their convictions that recent conditions demanded there be a change.

Mr. MORSE rose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Oregon wish me to yield?

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I most respectfully wish to suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that I raise this question because I know he does not want any of his remarks to be subject to any misinterpretation in these rather moving times by having read into them an intention the Senator did not mean. Therefore it is as a matter of courtesy that I rise to be of assistance to the Senator from Arkansas in clarifying what I think there is need of clarification in the RECORD, with regard to his discussion of impeachment. I say

this because surprisingly there are apparently forces on foot in this country that are bringing, at least to my own office, and I suppose to the offices of other Senators, telegraphic demands for the impeachment of the President of the United States. It disturbs me very much because I think it is merely a part of a dangerous emotional pattern sweeping the country.

The Senator from Arkansas in his intention to compare the British system of government with the American system of government, I am sure, sought to point out that the Secretary of State does not hold an analogous or comparative office to that of the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Then the Senator made some remarks, which, I say, I am fearful may be misinterpreted by the press to the effect that if we wanted to accomplish what apparently critics of our foreign policy are seeking to accomplish, the proper course would be to impeach the President. I am fearful that that remark of the Senator from Arkansas—and I think that is a pretty fair statement of what he said—may cause some people to overlook the fact that he was merely speaking analogously in regard to the two Governments, that of the United States and that of Great Britain, and that if we did have the kind of system that exists in Great Britain, then as a congressional body comparable to Parliament, we would express a lack of confidence in the Government.

But I would like to have the Senator from Arkansas make clear, if I understand what I think is his meaning, that under our Constitution, to use a hypothetical case, the fact that we may be in disagreement with the President of the United States on foreign policy or any other policy does not support, under our Constitution, an impeachment proceedings. The Constitution is pretty clear as to the grounds for impeachment, and there are no grounds for impeachment under our Constitution simply because the Congress finds itself in disagreement with the President of the United States over a matter of policy, be it foreign policy or any other policy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate very much the contribution of the Senator from Oregon. The Senator is quite right in his statement. I did not treat that subject in my prepared remarks at all. What I was trying to make clear was the difference between the situation in which Mr. Chamberlain found himself, which was referred to by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], right after Dunkerque, and so on, when he was removed from office.

The Senator from Oregon is quite right. I am not suggesting, and I do not think there is any question on that point, that difference of opinion in matters of policy does not furnish a valid ground for impeachment. The only way to get rid of the Executive for reasons of policy is by defeating him in an election.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to read two portions of the Constitution of the United States,



in order to make the matter clear in the RECORD?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. Article I, section 3, of the Constitution provides that—

The Senate shall have the sole power to try all impeachments.

Proceedings for that purpose—

shall be on oath or affirmation. When the President of the United States is tried, the Chief Justice shall preside; and no person shall be convicted without the concurrence of two-thirds of the members present.

Then article II, section 4 thereof, reads:

The President, Vice President, and all civil officers of the United States shall be removed from office on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator from Oregon. Since the Senator brought up that point I wish to emphasize that I was certainly not suggesting that the President be impeached or that proceedings be instituted for that purpose. Of course, I would oppose such action. I would go further and say that even on the merits, aside from the timing of this action by the members of the minority party, I do not think a continuation of the pressure to oust the Secretary of State, and in that way to try to solve the question at the moment, is a contribution to our way of government. Though I have had differences with the administration on matters of policy, I have never subscribed to the idea that the Secretary of State has any leaning toward the Communist line, or to Russia, or that he is an appeaser. I do not, by reason of the fact that I did not seek to question or to differ with some of the remarks of the Senator from California, wish to have it understood thereby that I acquiesce in them, or accept them as being valid. I did not intend to and do not intend to introduce that particular aspect of our foreign policy into the discussion.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for his contribution, and I desire to make it clear that I think it would be a great tragedy to seek to change our policy by any kind of impeachment proceedings.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As one of those who were at the conference, and who, as the public knows, did not feel that the course my colleagues took was a wise one at this time—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. For which I commend the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. But that I rather favored the approach which would call upon the leadership of both parties to get together with the administration to see whether the changes which we all want to explore and have brought about could be brought about, I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas if he feels that such a procedure might have been successful, and that those on the Democratic side as well as on the Republican side would have joined together in the matter if my colleagues had

not seen fit to take the other position? I do not wish to criticize my colleagues.

I do not agree with the wisdom of the course they took. But many of us felt that any effort to get together to work this matter out would be perfectly fruitless because in the last analysis nothing could be done about it, and that there was a great desire in the country to have some action taken to express lack of confidence. But I think the action that was taken was unwise, as the Senator from Arkansas has pointed out. I wish to obtain an expression from the Democratic side as to whether they would have sat down with us and worked out a solution.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am a very poor one to whom to address such a question. I am not in any sense among the leaders on this side, nor am I close to the administration. So I have no grounds for saying what could have been done in that direction. I can only add that some kind of cooperation, nonpartisan cooperation, with the best of will, is certainly called for under the circumstances. I think the leaders should get together on this matter as well as with respect to all other problems which are troubling us.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I think I can speak for all my colleagues here when I say that the action taken on this particular issue is no way showed a lack of support for the Secretary of State in his present mission. Of course, I did not vote for the resolution, but my colleagues added a paragraph indicating that we were entirely behind the administration in an effort to work out the problem.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To me that is entirely contradictory, if I may say so.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am speaking now of intent. I am confident there was no intent to hamstring or, as was previously suggested, to pull the rug out from under the Secretary of State just at this moment when he is on the way to Brussels.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am trying to make it plain I do not question the intentions or motives of the Republicans at all. I am only questioning their wisdom in taking this action.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It is difficult for me to differ with the Senator from Arkansas, because that is my position.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The situation is difficult enough as it is, and I hope we can keep our discussion on the basis of only the matter of the wisdom of the courses that are being proposed or pursued.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 3263. An act to amend Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 with respect to certain mothers of veterans;

S. 3654. An act to amend section 3 of the Postal Salary Act of July 6, 1945;

S. 3672. An act to amend section 3 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to make the exclusion from such act of tem-

porary employees of the Senate and House of Representatives inapplicable to such employees with one or more years of service;

S. 3910. An act relating to the assignment of surplus clerks in the Postal Transportation Service;

S. 4102. An act relating to contracts for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other mechanical devices;

S. 4229. An act to extend to certain persons who served in the military, naval, or air service on or after June 27, 1950, the benefits of Public Law No. 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended;

S. 4240. An act to amend the act incorporating The American Legion so as to redefine eligibility for membership therein;

S. 4254. An act to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II); and

S. J. Res. 209. Joint resolution to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 4234) to promote the foreign policy and provide for the defense and general welfare of the United States by furnishing emergency relief assistance to Yugoslavia.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5487) to provide for the review of orders of the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, and of certain orders of the Secretary of Agriculture made under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, and the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, as amended, and of orders of the United States Maritime Commission or the Federal Maritime Board under the Shipping Act, 1916, as amended, and the Intercoastal Shipping Act, 1933, as amended.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9802) to grant succession to the War Damage Corporation, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 297. An act for the relief of Ruggiero DiCortanzo;

S. 995. An act for the relief of Irene George Livanos;

S. 1344. An act for the relief of Gerda Moller Uldall and her son, Mikkell Moller;

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Elmer Beller;

S. 1816. An act for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co.;

S. 2179. An act for the relief of Stephen A. Patkay and his wife, Madeleine;

S. 2420. An act for the relief of Shaoul Minashi Shami, Emily Shami, Joseph Clement Shami, and Charles Henry Shami;

S. 2513. An act to give a short title to the act of July 1, 1898, commonly known as the Bankruptcy Act;

S. 2702. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel;

S. 2799. An act for the relief of Johan Wilhelm Adriaans;

S. 2803. An act for the relief of Angela Maria Pisano;

S. 2961. An act for the relief of Magdalena L. Jardeleza, Jr.;

S. 2968. An act for the relief of Chen Hua Huang;

S. 3066. An act for the relief of Dionisio Aguirre Irastorza;

S. 3067. An act for the relief of Andres Aguirre Irastorza;

S. 3091. An act for the relief of Master Stanley (Zachne) Hiller;

S. 3250. An act for the relief of Marne Post No. 28, American Legion, New Martinsville, W. Va.;

S. 3329. An act for the relief of Kiyomi Kitamura;

S. 3406. An act for the relief of Lee Yee Yen;

S. 3430. An act for the relief of Martina Arnaiz Zarandona (Sister Blanca Eugenia);

S. 3444. An act for the relief of Victor Francis Oberschall;

S. 3484. An act for the relief of Barbara Sugihara;

S. 3519. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Chester Stevens;

S. 3965. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.;

S. 4072. An act for the relief of Ella Stufka and her son;

S. 4074. An act for the relief of Pamela Bentley;

S. 4111. An act for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio;

H. R. 2734. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 730), as amended; and

H. R. 8136. An act for the relief of Giuseppe Umberto Mantalban-Troy.

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, December 18, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 297. An act for the relief of Ruggiero DiCostanzo;

S. 995. An act for the relief of Irene George Livanos;

S. 1344. An act for the relief of Gerda Moller Uldall and her son, Mikkel Moller;

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Elmer Beller;

S. 1816. An act for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co.;

S. 2179. An act for the relief of Stephen A. Patkay and his wife Madeleine;

S. 2420. An act for the relief of Shaoul Minashi Shami, Emily Shami, Joseph Clement Shami, and Charles Henry Shami;

S. 2512. An act to give a short title to the act of July 1, 1898, commonly known as the Bankruptcy Act;

S. 2702. An act for the relief of Louis E. Gabel;

S. 2799. An act for the relief of Johan Wilhelm Adriaans;

S. 2803. An act for the relief of Angela Maria Pisano;

S. 2961. An act for the relief of Magdalena L. Jardeleza, Jr.;

S. 2968. An act for the relief of Chen Hua Huang;

S. 3066. An act for the relief of Dionisio Aguirre Irastorza;

S. 3067. An act for the relief of Andres Aguirre Irastorza;

S. 3091. An act for the relief of Master Stanley (Zachne) Hiller;

S. 3250. An act for the relief of Marne Post No. 28, American Legion, New Martinsville, W. Va.;

S. 3329. An act for the relief of Kiyomi Kitamura;

S. 3406. An act for the relief of Lee Yee Yen;

S. 3430. An act for the relief of Martina Arnaiz Zarandona (Sister Blanca Eugenia);

S. 3444. An act for the relief of Victor Francis Oberschall;

S. 3484. An act for the relief of Barbara Sugihara;

S. 3519. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to James Chester Stevens;

S. 3965. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Lamm Lumber Co.;

S. 4072. An act for the relief of Ella Stufka and her son;

S. 4074. An act for the relief of Pamela Bentley; and

S. 4111. An act for the relief of Southern Fireproofing Co., of Cincinnati, Ohio.

#### EMERGENCY POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate a communication addressed to the Vice President, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, as follows:

#### THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, December 18, 1950.

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,

President, United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: The defense effort we are now undertaking in order to meet the critical world situation will call for the use of a number of emergency powers. Many of these powers can be exercised under the authority of legislation now in effect. It is clear, however, that, as our mobilization program moves forward, there will be need for additional legislative authority. A number of proposals for new legislation are now being studied in the executive branch, and I expect to transmit recommendations to the Congress from time to time for emergency legislation as it becomes necessary.

Two of the measures which we know will be needed are of such importance for the tasks immediately ahead, that I wish to request action by the present Congress before adjournment.

The first of these is legislation along the general lines of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, which contained the emergency reorganization powers available to the President during World War II.

The current mobilization effort requires that the President be able to adjust from time to time, by rapid Executive action, the organization of the executive branch. Clear authority should be provided to establish such defense agencies as may be required, to coordinate, consolidate, transfer, and utilize existing agencies and officers, and to rearrange Government functions and personnel. Only in this way can the organization of the executive branch be kept continuously in line with the evolving requirements of defense mobilization.

In World War II the provisions of title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, were used extensively in matters of vital importance to the war effort. For example, there were established under the authority of that title such major agencies as the War Production Board, the War Manpower Commission, and the War Shipping Administration.

It is clear that in a number of instances there may be need for similar kinds of action very quickly, as the present defense program moves forward. The Director of Defense Mobilization, Mr. Wilson, is already beginning to review the scope and character of our present programs and organizational arrangements in relation to the expanding job which lies ahead. As soon as changes are found to be necessary, the President should be enabled to place them in effect. Delay would only hamper the over-all effort. Therefore, it is of great importance that the necessary legislative authority be made available now, for the duration of the national emergency.

As was the case in World War II, these powers will not be used to make permanent changes in the organization of the Government. The changes that will be made under this authority will be temporary in nature, for the purpose of furthering the defense effort. When the emergency has ended, the agencies affected will revert to their present status unless further action is taken by the Congress.

The second of these measures on which I wish to request action by the Congress before adjournment of the present session is legislation along the lines of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941, which contained the emergency contracting provisions in effect during World War II.

The authority to let contracts through negotiation can now be exercised as a result of the declaration of a national emergency. However, there is considerable doubt as to whether authority now exists for modifying contracts after they have been entered into.

It is already apparent that the agencies responsible for defense production will need authority to modify existing contracts in order to avoid undue delays in production and to keep suppliers in business on Government work.

For example, some Government suppliers now face possible bankruptcy because fixed prices in their Government contracts are entirely inadequate to meet rising costs. In certain cases, contract price adjustments are essential to keep these firms in production. Other Government contractors, engaged in especially hazardous work for the military services, may have to be indemnified promptly for damage to facilities and equipment in order that repairs or replacement may be undertaken without delay.

In these and many other instances, contract adjustments are needed to speed defense procurement. Therefore, I urge that title II powers again be made available, so long as the emergency lasts.

Representatives of the executive branch stand ready to furnish the appropriate committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives any information or assistance which may be desired in connection with these matters.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.



PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I call up the conference report on Senate bill 3357, to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, and ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, and agree to the same.

ED C. JOHNSON,  
ERNEST MCFARLAND  
E. C. J.,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS,  
*Managers of the Part of the Senate.*

DWIGHT L. ROGERS,  
LINDLEY BECKWORTH,  
J. PERCY PRIEST,  
JAMES I. DOLLIVER,  
JOHN B. BENNETT,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the present consideration of the conference report.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on Senate bill 3357. [Putting the question.]

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado a question, if he will yield to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. McMAHON. I understand that the conference report on the Yugoslav aid authorization bill will be ready a little later in the afternoon. I am informed that the conference report on Senate bill 3357 may take considerable time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope the Senator from Connecticut is mistaken, and that it will not take very long to dispose of the conference report on Senate bill 3357. For many months it has been ready for disposition by the Senate. It came to us in September, at which time it was debated at length. The further consideration of the conference report has been postponed because of important measures coming before the Senate, and in the interval the Senate has considered a great many measures of importance. I hope most of the debate on the conference report has been ex-

hausted, and that we shall be able to proceed very quickly to vote on it, so that we shall not delay action on the matter about which the Senator from Connecticut is very properly so much concerned.

Mr. McMAHON. I join the Senator in the hope that this matter can be disposed of very quickly, and I certainly favor having the Senate dispose of it.

My question is this: If the conference report on the Yugoslav aid authorization bill is ready a little later in the afternoon, as I think it will be, inasmuch as I believe that it is now not controversial, or at least that it will not provoke any lengthy debate, would the Senator be disposed to agree to a unanimous-consent proposal to have the Senate take up the conference report on the Yugoslav aid authorization bill, and temporarily lay aside the conference report on Senate bill 3357?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, Mr. President, I have been cooperating with Senators in regard to all matters coming up while the conference report on Senate bill 3357 has been ready for action by the Senate. I refer particularly to cooperation in regard to action by the Senate on all matters of vital importance to the United States and to our international affairs. So far as I am concerned, of course I would not wish to cause one moment's delay in connection with action by the Senate on the conference report the Senator from Connecticut has mentioned.

Mr. McMAHON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as I have said, this conference report has been before the Senate for a long time.

First, I wish to refer to the proposed legislation with reference to the transportation of slot machines. This measure grew out of a crime conference called by the Attorney General of the United States. The attorneys general of all the States, I believe, and representatives of the cities—either their mayors or persons appointed by them—held a crime conference, and made certain recommendations. As a result of those recommendations, the Attorney General of the United States sent to the Congress two pieces of proposed legislation. One of them is Senate bill 3357. This bill was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and was reported from that committee by a unanimous vote in favor of passage of the bill. The bill then was placed on the calendar. When the calendar was called, Senate bill 3357 was passed by the unanimous vote of the Senate, and went to the House of Representatives. In the House the bill was amended. Conferees were named by the Senate and by the House to resolve the differences between the two bodies in regard to the bill. After considerable discussion in the conference, the measure we have before us today was reported by unanimous vote of all the conferees on the part of both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

I have received from the Attorney General of the United States a letter, under date of November 29, addressed to me as chairman of the Senate Committee

on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The letter reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C., November 29, 1950.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,  
Chairman, Committee on Interstate  
and Foreign Commerce, United  
States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am most desirous that the Senate promptly and favorably consider the bill (S. 3357) to prohibit the interstate transportation of gambling devices. To that end I request your cooperation by calling up the conference report on the bill as soon as practicable.

The desirability of and need for this legislation are self-evident, and become more apparent with each passing day.

Sincerely,

J. HOWARD McGRATH,  
Attorney General.

Today I received by messenger another letter from the Attorney General. This letter was dated in his office on December 15, but I received it just today. The letter reads as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Washington, D. C., December 15, 1950.

Hon. EDWIN C. JOHNSON,  
Chairman, Interstate and  
Foreign Commerce Committee,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This week in Miami, Fla., the National Association of Attorneys General held a conference and among other things discussed at length the bill (S. 3357) dealing with the prohibition of the transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce.

The members of this conference strongly urged that this legislation be passed by the Congress of the United States inasmuch as it was their considered opinion that such a bill would go far to aid them in combating crime in their respective States.

As you recall, I wrote to you some time ago—

That is the letter I just read—

urging the passage of this bill on behalf of the members of the Attorney General's Conference on Organized Crime held here in Washington, D. C., on February 15, 1950. Again I strongly urge you on behalf of the National Association of Attorneys General, the members of the Attorney General's Conference on Organized Crime, and the Department of Justice to use every effort to bring about the passage of this bill before the closing session of this Congress.

Sincerely,

J. HOWARD McGRATH,  
Attorney General.

Mr. President, I am going to make every effort within my power and upon my responsibility to bring this matter to a vote on the part of the Senate, so that the conference report and the proposed legislation may be disposed of.

I wish to read into the RECORD a very brief article published in the Washington Post under date of December 7. I may say that I have in my files many editorials, published by newspapers in the United States, urging and demanding that the Senate and the House of Representatives complete action on this proposed legislation and enact it into law. Today I shall read only one brief newspaper article, as follows:

McGRATH LETTER RENEWS DEMAND FOR BAN ON SLOT.

Attorney General McGrath yesterday renewed an urgent plea that Congress prohibit interstate shipment of slot machines.

He told Chairman EDWIN C. JOHNSON, Democrat, Colorado, of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee, in a letter which McCarth made public today—

In fact, he made it public before I received it; I read it in the newspapers before I received it—

that with each passing day the need for a law banning shipment of the machines becomes more apparent.

Both the House and Senate have passed such a bill, but in different forms. A compromise measure has been blocked by Senator MALONE, Democrat of Nevada—

So the article states. I know that the Senator from Nevada will object very much to that, but that is the way the press report reads—

who talked against it for 11 hours just before Congress recessed last September.

The ban was originally proposed by the Attorney General's crime conference here last February.

As I have said, I have a great many editorials dealing with the subject, but I shall not burden the RECORD with them. Some of them take the Senator from Nevada to task, and I do not want to place anything of that kind in the RECORD, because I am presuming that the Senator from Nevada is acting from patriotic motives as he sees the situation.

Perhaps I should again read into the RECORD the differences between the House and Senate measures. They are stated in the RECORD of last September 19, but we shall all perhaps want to refresh our memories with respect to them.

The House struck out the definition of gambling devices contained in the original Justice Department bill, and substituted a much more specific and narrow definition, the effect of which is to limit the bill exclusively to slot machines and to exclude from the bill pin-ball machines. The conference agreed to this change. However, the definition in the conference report is still broad enough to include slot machines which do not pay off in cash and are paid off in merchandise. That is No. 1.

No. 2. The House bill defines "State" to include Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Guam. This places these Territories in exactly the same position as the individual States. Hence, the legislative assemblies of all States and Territories would have the power to authorize the transportation of slot machines into such State or Territory.

Prior to this change in the bill these Territories were treated like poor relatives with respect to this matter. They were not given the dignity to which they were entitled, and the provision in the House bill extends to them rights which they should have with respect to gambling devices.

No. 3: It will be noted that the conference report version tightens the original Justice Department language by requiring the various States specifically to pass laws exempting such States from the provisions of the new law instead of merely allowing the governor to certify to the Attorney General that the State now has such a law. The effect, therefore, is to require each State legislature to enact legislation exempting that State or a par-

ticular subdivision of it from the effect of the Federal law. The Federal law does not go beyond the borders of any State. Any State can legalize slot machines and gambling devices. This bill has no effect whatever upon the laws of such a State. It does not go that far. All it concerns itself with is the transportation from one State into another. The House eliminated a provision which would have barred exportation of slot machines to foreign countries.

No. 4: The conference report requires every manufacturer and dealer in gambling devices to register annually with the Attorney General of the United States. The original Justice Department language would have required registration with the Collector of Internal Revenue in the collection district in which the business is carried on.

No. 5: The conference report modifies section 5 of the Senate bill by extending the prohibition to American flag ships on the high seas.

No. 6: The conference report also consolidates the penalty sections into a single penalty of \$5,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment for violations of all provisions of the bill. The Justice Department has provided two classes of penalties, a \$5,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment for violation of section 2, which prohibits the interstate transportation of gambling devices, and violation of section 5, which prohibits the manufacture, transport, possession, or use of gambling devices on Federal territory; and a \$2,000 fine and 1 year imprisonment for violation of section 3, which deals with the registration of manufacturers of and dealers in gambling devices, and violation of section 4, which deals with the marking of packages containing gambling devices.

So, Mr. President, the sixth change in the House bill has to do with the consolidation of the penalty sections into a single penalty of a \$5,000 fine and 2 years imprisonment, instead of the different categories which I have read.

Mr. President, as I have already said, this conference report was debated at great length in the Senate on September 19. I do not think it necessary to debate it again in such detail. If there are any questions as to the result of the changes proposed in the conference report, I shall be glad to try to answer them. The Senate conferees were informed that the language as finally adopted by the House was discussed with the Attorney General of the United States, who said he liked the language of the House bill much better than the language of the Senate bill. He approved the changes which were made in it.

Of course, we all know that the Attorney General of the United States has no authority to enact laws. He does not belong to the legislative department of this great Government. But this bill came from his office. It came from his office, not because of any particular thinking in the Justice Department, but because of a crime conference which was called, at which the mayors and attorneys general of the country assembled, and at which they made recommendations. Because of those recommenda-

tions by the law enforcement officers throughout the United States, the Attorney General wrote the department bill and sent it to the Congress. The Senate acted very promptly, as I have said. The House Committee held hearings lasting several days—and I commend them for it—at which time they gave everyone an opportunity to be heard either for or against the bill. They gave more attention to it, perhaps, than did the Senate. We passed it just as the Attorney General sent it to us, without crossing a "t" or dotting an "i." We enacted into law the bill which he recommended, because of the origin of this bill, coming out of the crime conference as it did. But in my humble opinion, and I have given considerable study to the subject, I think the House version makes it a much more acceptable, a more constructive measure, and I earnestly hope the Senate will very promptly enact into law the conference report on Senate bill 3357.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

GAMBLING DEVICES BILL—THE SENATE-HOUSE CONFERENCE REPORT ON SENATE BILL 3357 NULLIFYING STATE LAWS

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Colorado for his straightforward statement that the bill was written by the Attorney General of the United States and passed by the Senate exactly as he requested it.

NO OBJECTION TO SENATE BILL

I want to say, Mr. President, that the junior Senator from Nevada has no objection to this proposed legislation because the bill as passed by the Senate simply provided that wherever the use of such gambling devices was legal, as certified by the Governor of a State to the United States Attorney General, unbroken shipments from point of origin may go into that State.

DID NOT NULLIFY A STATE LAW

There was no objection because it did not nullify any law of any State, so far as the junior Senator from Nevada knew.

INCLUDES ALL GAMBLING DEVICES

I have to take issue with the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado that the House bill upon which the conferees agreed, only includes slot machines. It includes all gambling devices. This to me would mean the destruction of the thoroughbred horse industry since the parimutuel machines would be included along with roulette wheels and slot machines and other gambling devices. The Senate bill, which the Attorney General wrote, did not mention slot machines, but included all gambling devices. This, in my opinion, was proper because it did not nullify the 20-year-old gambling law of my State of Nevada. The governor merely certifies to the Attorney General of the United States that their use is legal.

HOUSE SUBSTITUTED ANOTHER BILL

Mr. President, the House of Representatives substituted another bill, almost in its entirety, and in that bill nullified a 20-year-old law of the State



of Nevada through requiring an entirely new act to be passed by our legislature to exempt our State from the provisions of the act.

This would also be true of the shipment of parimutuel machines into States where horse racing is legal, thus nullifying the laws of those States making the use of such machines legal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MALONE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The conference report does not change or modify in the slightest degree any law of the State of Nevada. It simply exercises the constitutional right of the Congress to enact legislation affecting interstate commerce. Congress has acted in that capacity many times. The Senator will recall the Dyer Act relating to automobiles stolen in interstate commerce; the Mann Act with respect to white slavery; the Prison Goods Act which went to the Supreme Court. In the Whip and Collar case, as I recall, the Court established the right of the Federal Government and the Congress to enact this kind of legislation to protect the people. So that there is nothing new in this proposed legislation—

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I yield for a question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I have no question to ask at this time.

#### NOT LEGAL TO STEAL AUTOMOBILES

Mr. MALONE. I would simply say, in order to clarify the matter, that the Dyer Act prohibited the movement of stolen automobiles across State lines. It, of course, did not nullify any State law, because no State had made it legal to steal automobiles. Nor were any other of the acts enumerated by the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado pertinent to this issue. They have no possible connection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator contend that the State of Nevada passed a law which opened the commerce of the country to the shipment of slot machines? Is that what he is saying? What law of the State of Nevada does this bill change?

#### THE HOUSE ACT NULLIFIES THE NEVADA 20-YEAR-OLD GAMBLING ACT

Mr. MALONE. The State of Nevada passed an act making gambling legal within the confines of that State. The passage of that act was within the framework of the Constitution, and this bill nullifies that law.

On the face of it, I do not see how the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado could assert otherwise. Under the provisions of the bill as presented now, it would be necessary for the State of Nevada to enact a new law to exempt itself from legislation passed by the Congress of the United States.

No one asserted the Attorney General sent a bill to the House.

The Attorney General sent a bill here to the Senate, and it was passed, as the distinguished Senator has said, without

crossing a "t" or dotting an "i." That was all right, and no one objected, because, as the Attorney General wrote it, it did not nullify the 20-year-old gambling law of Nevada. It was only required that the Governor of Nevada certify that the use of such gambling devices was legal.

#### ATTORNEY GENERAL'S VERSION SUBMITTED TO THE SENATE

The initiation of the law was approved at a meeting of attorneys general, then submitted to the Senate by the United States Attorney General, and I approve of it. This is the exact language of the report, written, I assume, either by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois or his assistants, on Senate bill 3357, Report No. 1482, from which I read:

#### EXCERPT FROM SENATE REPORT NO. 1482

The bill herein recommended for enactment was transmitted to the Congress of the United States by Attorney General J. Howard McGrath on April 1, 1950. It grew out of the Attorney General's Crime Conference of representatives of local, State, and Federal law-enforcement officials which met in Washington on February 15, 1950, to discuss law-enforcement problems with reference to organized crime. The Crime Conference adopted a resolution specifically endorsing the proposed legislation and requesting the Attorney General to transmit it to the Congress with a request for enactment. Enactment of the bill was endorsed by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee earlier this year.

#### NO OBJECTIONS TO THE SENATE BILL

Mr. President, I have heard no objections to the Senate bill. Certainly if there had been objection, the bill would not have been passed on the consent calendar. But I say, Mr. President, that the bill passed by the House and agreed to by the Senate conferees is not the bill which the Attorney General sent to the Congress of the United States. He did not send this bill, and no one has asserted that he did. As to the proposed legislation which the Attorney General sent to the Senate, there is no record of his having sent it any other place. The bill, as written by the Attorney General, did not nullify the 20-year-old law legalizing gambling in the State of Nevada. There was no objection to it.

#### HOUSE CONFEREES DOMINATED THE CONFERENCE

I can understand how possibly the House conferees, being more assertive than is the senior Senator from Colorado, were allowed to rewrite the bill.

The junior Senator from Nevada asked to be invited before the conference, and he understands that that practice is customary, when there is an important piece of legislation in which a Senator is interested, whether he is a member of the conference or not. But he was not invited.

#### A SENATOR'S ATTENDANCE AT A CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

I am not informed whether the subject of my attendance was brought up and discussed. I do not know whether they discussed the question of allowing at such conference anyone who might have objection to the interference with a long-established State law passed

within the framework of the Constitution of the United States.

#### NOT A MEMBER OF ANY STATE LEGISLATURE

Mr. President, I am not a member of the Nevada Legislature. I am not a member of the Kentucky Legislature, which voted for local option. I am not a member of the legislature of any of our 48 States.

Any State legislature could pass an act which may not conform to the junior Senator from Nevada's ideas of proper legislation.

#### LEGALIZED HORSE RACING

Legalized horse racing is permitted in California, Florida, Illinois, and in other States of the Union. The junior Senator from Nevada has nothing to say about such laws which are or may have been passed by such State legislatures. However, I would object on the floor of the Senate to the passage of any legislation which would seek to nullify any State law by the simple device of making it illegal to ship race horses across State lines. That is similar to what is sought to be done here.

#### THE CONTROVERSIAL SECTION 2 OF THE BILL

Mr. President, so that the RECORD may be complete, as the distinguished Senator from Colorado has said, the subject was debated at some length, and the debate with reference to it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 20 and September 21.

I should like to read into the RECORD a part of section 2 of the Senate bill, and I ask that the remainder of the section be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### SECTION 2—SENATE BILL

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce any gambling device, or knowingly to take, receive, possess, or dispose of any gambling device transported in violation of this act: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to the course of unbroken interstate transportation of any gambling device into any State where the use of such device is legal, as certified by the governor of the State to the Attorney General of the United States and published by the Attorney General in the Federal Register. In the absence of such certification and publication, the use of gambling devices in any State shall, for the purposes of this act, be presumed to be illegal; and all persons and officials affected by the provisions of this act shall be entitled to act in reliance upon the presumption.

Nothing in this act shall be construed to interfere with or reduce the authority, or the existing interpretations of the authority, of the Federal Trade Commission under the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended (15 U. S. C. 41-58).

Mr. MALONE. I read from section 2 of the Senate bill:

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce any gambling device—

The remainder of the bill is confined to definitions and penalties, and this section represents the heart of the bill. This is the bill which the Attorney Gen-

eral of the United States sent to the Senate—

or knowingly to take, receive, possess, or dispose of any gambling device transported in violation of this act: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to the course of unbroken interstate transportation of any gambling device into any State where the use of such device is legal, as certified by the governor of the State—

I ask the Senators to listen to this portion—

as certified by the governor of the State to the Attorney General of the United States and published by the Attorney General in the Federal Register.

Mr. President, that is the provision in the bill which was sent to the Senate by the United States Attorney General. He never to my knowledge wrote any other bill or made any other suggestion in that respect. I read further:

In the absence of such certification and publication, the use of gambling devices in any State shall, for the purposes of this act, be presumed to be illegal; and all persons and officials affected by the provisions of this act shall be entitled to act in reliance upon the presumption.

Legislative action by the States represents the wishes of the people of that State. The members of a State legislature have more opportunity to know what the people of their State want than does the distinguished Senator from Colorado or the junior Senator from Nevada, neither of whom are members of State legislatures.

#### SECTION 2 OF THE HOUSE BILL

Mr. President, I now wish to read section 2 of the bill as passed by the House. I ask permission that any parts of the section which I do not read be made a part of the Record at this point.

Section 2 of the House bill provides:

Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful knowingly to transport any gambling device to any place in a State, the District of Columbia, or a Territory or possession of the United States from any place outside of such State, the District of Columbia, or a Territory or possession: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to transportation of any gambling device to a place in any State which has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State from the provisions of this section, or to a place in any subdivision of a State if the State in which such subdivision is located has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such subdivision from the provisions of this section.

#### TWENTY-YEAR-OLD LAW NULLIFIED BY CONFERENCE REPORT—HOUSE BILL

Mr. President, what would it do? What is the meaning of it? It means that a 20-year-old law in my State of Nevada would be nullified. Another law would have to be passed. Before it could be passed it would have to go before committees and be debated by the two houses of the legislature.

#### THE CONGRESS IN SMALL BUSINESS TO NULLIFY STATE LAW

Mr. President, I submit that the Congress of the United States is indeed in small business if it seeks to nullify a law passed by a State legislature, especially one which was enacted as long ago as 20 years, particularly when no principle is involved or served. It is simply an attempt to nullify an act of the Legisla-

ture of Nevada by the passage of a Federal act.

#### QUESTION OF LEGAL GAMBLING NOT BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. President, I would say that the question of whether gambling should be legalized or not in the State of Nevada or in the United States of America is not before the Senate. Apparently no one has had the guts to submit such a bill for our consideration and face the issue clearly. If the Attorney General wants such a bill, to make all gambling illegal, let him introduce it. The Cabinet officers practically introduce bills—they control Congress, apparently. Everything they suggest is brought here without any proper consideration of its ultimate effect. Let the Attorney General introduce a bill prohibiting all gambling.

#### LET THE CONGRESS DEBATE GAMBLING ON ITS MERITS

Then let the Congress of the United States debate the bill on its merits. Let us not come in through the back door and try to nullify a 20-year-old law of a State simply because the proponents of such a measure do not have the intestinal fortitude to come out and say what they want to do.

Mr. President, I think I speak for every man, woman, and child in the State of Nevada when I say that the Nevada people want to do whatever is in their power to assist other States in enforcing its laws.

#### WOULD PROTECT ANY STATE'S RIGHT

The junior Senator from Nevada would stand on the floor of the Senate for another 12 hours, if it is necessary to do so, to protect the right of any other State to pass any legislation it wants to pass within the framework of the Constitution of the United States, without the Congress getting in its hair.

The moment we lose such a right we have gone another great step in the direction which I know the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado does not approve, and that is in the direction of a dictatorship in Washington. In other words, we would be bringing to Congress the power to pass upon all legislation by the States.

#### CITY OF WASHINGTON DANGEROUS TO THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

In the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, the city of Washington is the most dangerous city in the United States of America to the United States of America. Why do I say that? It is because every man, woman, and child in the city of Washington is either working for the Government, working for someone who is working for the Government, or selling something to someone who is working for the Government.

If one remained here for 3 months without going west of the city limits to again get the feel of the situation, to listen to the people making a living the hard way, he might conclude that everyone in the United States wanted to run the Government from here.

#### THE REPRESENTATIVES OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES

It is interesting to observe that there are 70, 80, or 90 consuls and ambassadors here. They are here at our expense, generally speaking, to get something out

of the United States through the Congress. They want gift loans and free trade so that there will be no obstacle to bringing in all kinds of products manufactured by their cheap, low-living-standard labor.

#### FREE TRADE A WAR ECONOMY—CAUSE OF FINE PEACETIME ECONOMY

We are now in a war economy. The minute the war is over the cheap-labor products of the European and Asiatic countries will come into the United States by the boatload and trainload, and our boys will be out of work.

#### THE 1934 TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

This process started in 1934, when we passed the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

Here, Mr. President, is an example of the thoughtlessness of the Congress.

The pending measure is not quite as serious—it does not affect as many people as does the 1934 Trade Agreements Act.

#### CONGRESS ABROGATED ITS RESPONSIBILITY

The Congress of the United States abrogated its responsibility under that act. By that act it transferred to the executive department, meaning in this case the great State Department, its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade through tariffs and import fees.

#### IT WOULD BE A SHAME TO OFFEND MR. ACHESON

This afternoon I listened to some very learned debate as to whether someone might have offended Mr. Acheson. Under cover, the free-trade sell-out of the workers and investors of this Nation is being completed at Torquay, England, today. It is said that the conferences will last until March. More than 100 so-called trade treaties are under discussion.

In the first place, there is no such thing as a trade treaty. Our tariffs are being lowered; and if another nation, by any chance does lower one of its tariffs, the possibility of anything being imported into that country is nil because of their quotas, embargoes, manipulation of currency values, and all known subterfuges. It is a one-way street.

#### UNEMPLOYMENT IN PEACETIME

We are now on a war economy. In June of this year, there were between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 unemployed in this country, because of the products of cheap labor shipped into our market. There were between 10,000,000 and 12,000,000 partially unemployed. Mr. Sawyer stated, after the war had been in progress for about 60 days, "We cured the unemployment situation."

#### ANOTHER EXAMPLE OF APPROPRIATING STATE'S RIGHTS

Mr. President, that is a tough way to cure unemployment. We have done it twice in the past 10 years—three major democratic wars in a generation—through the Democratic Party being captured by the Socialist Party and becoming a war party.

The pending measure is merely another example of the thoughtlessness of the Congress of the United States in transferring its responsible powers out of its jurisdiction and taking unto itself the rights of the States. I have been



present on the floor of the Senate many times when the question of States' rights has been discussed. I have never seen the majority of the Senate vote for abrogating States' rights.

DO NOT GAMBLE—BUT WILL PROTECT STATE'S RIGHT TO LEGALIZE IT

Mr. President, personally I do not gamble. I take no particular credit for that fact. I simply do not gamble. But if the people of Mississippi or the people of Nevada or the people of Montana want to enact a law legalizing gambling devices, and the State law is within the framework of the Constitution of the United States, I will do all in my power to protect the action of that legislature. That is what I am doing today. That is what I did during the 12-hour debate in September.

GOVERNORS BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PRESIDENT

If we continue the steady encroachment upon States' rights, taking them in one by one, it will be only a very short time before the governors of the 48 States will be only a board of directors for the President of the United States. It is a pattern, Mr. President. The trend has been going on for 18 years. It is my honest belief that the senior Senator from Colorado also objects to it in his heart.

HOUSE HAS NOT APPROVED CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. President, it is customary, and has been for many years, when a Senate bill passes and it goes to conference and the conferees agree on a report, that the House consider adopting the report first. It is customary, if a House bill passes and is passed by the Senate and sent to conference, and the conferees agree, for the Senate to consider the report first. For some unknown reason we are presented with the conference report without the House having first approved it as has become the custom.

WHAT ARE THE CONCEALED OBJECTIVES OF THE BILL?

Mr. President, there is a brief sentence in the report, No. 3111, which states that a couple of amendments were adjusted in the conference. I read from the report:

The second amendment would have permitted a State which has enacted a law providing for the exemption of such State from the provisions of section 2 of the bill to ship gambling devices from such State for repairs into another State.

The language which turned down that amendment is something out of this world. "The House conferees felt that these two amendments"—but referring particularly to the second amendment—"are incompatible with the objectives of this legislation."

Mr. President, what are the objectives of this legislation? Are they to help the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado enforce the law in Colorado, or are they to make it impossible for any State to operate a gambling device, regardless of the State law? According to this language, if a machine is shipped to another State for repair, when there are no repair facilities in the State where the gambling device is legally used, it would seem that it is not the objectives of the bill to enforce the law in other States.

The objective seems to be to prevent a State which has a law making the use of such gambling devices legal from actually utilizing such devices by preventing them from being returned for repairs.

THE SUBJECT OF WHETHER SUCH DEVICES SHOULD BE LEGAL—NOT UNDER DISCUSSION

The junior Senator from Nevada is not discussing whether the use of these gambling devices should be legal in Nevada or in any State within the United States. He is not discussing the question as to whether they should be legal in the State of Nevada or the State of Mississippi, or the State of Florida, for the simple reason that that question is not before the Senate.

The question before the Senate is, Shall it become the practice of the Congress of the United States to go through the back door and nullify and defeat the objective of the laws of a State even though they have been passed within the framework of the Constitution of the United States?

DEFENDING THE RIGHTS OF STATE LEGISLATURES

There are, no doubt, persons in my State, and persons in Mississippi, the State of the Presiding Officer, and persons in every other State who do not feel the use of gambling devices should be made legal.

As the junior Senator from Nevada has said, he is not a member of the Nevada Legislature. He is not a member of any other State legislature. He is a Member of the Senate of the United States, and, as such, regards as his responsibility and his duty to defend the right of any State to pass any law it wants to, within, of course, the framework of the Constitution, without the Congress getting into its hair.

BILL TO PROHIBIT ALL GAMBLING

If Congress should want to pass legislation prohibiting gambling of every nature, we would discuss roulette, slot machines, pari-mutuels for horse racing; we would discuss the use of all gambling devices, including the use of playing cards. Many persons are adverse to the use of playing cards. Many are against horse racing.

This bill would merely snipe at horse racing by prohibiting the shipment of such devices in interstate commerce.

Mr. President, what we are now considering may be merely the first step.

Perhaps the next step will be to make it illegal to send a race horse or a pack of playing cards across a State line. This bill prohibits the shipment of pari-mutuel machines in interstate commerce—which I am advised, would severely curtail the race-horse and the quarter-horse industry. It may then be provided that there must be a breeding farm in every State, that there must be a card factory in every State, and a pari-mutuel machine factory in every State.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of my remarks I shall move to refer the legislation back to the conference committee with instructions to the Senate conferees that they stay with the Senate legislation, as they should have done in the first place, or at least to the extent that they will oppose the nullifying of

any State law which has been passed within the framework of the Constitution.

ASK CONFEREES NOT TO NULLIFY STATE LAWS

All the junior Senator from Nevada asks is that the Senate conferees not agree to the nullification of a State law and make additional legislation necessary.

LEGAL GAMBLING NOT BEFORE SENATE

Mr. President, I wish to reiterate at this point that the question of whether or not gambling should be legal in any State of the Union is not before the Senate.

The only question before the Senate today is that raised by the conference report. The question the junior Senator from Nevada raises is the advisability of the Senate conferees accepting proposed legislation contained in a conference report, when the legislation proposed by the Senate itself did not contain such proposals.

I question the advisability of the proposed legislation as passed by the House and accepted by the conferees which would nullify a 20-year-old law of a sovereign State of the Nation—a law passed within the framework of the Constitution of the United States, and expressing the will of the people of that State.

Mr. President, I can sympathize with the people of Colorado if they cannot enforce their laws against gambling devices in Colorado. I cannot, however, agree that they should nullify another State's law in order to enforce their own.

ANY CHIEF OF POLICE CAN ENFORCE LAW

The chief of police in any city of America, backed by his mayor and city council, in a city where gambling is illegal, could close up gambling in that city within 24 hours. Is it because men cannot be obtained in certain States who will enforce the State laws against gambling that it is proposed here that Congress pass legislation which would nullify the law of another State which handles the proposition in an entirely different manner.

DO NOT MAINTAIN IT IS PERFECT ANSWER

I do not say the method used by Nevada in the matter of gambling or anything else is a complete answer to any of the problems involved. The junior Senator from Nevada has never said that. But the Nevada Legislature—the Assembly and the State Senate—elected by the voters in all the precincts in the State, has spoken for Nevada in the matter.

Mr. President, I have never said that the solution of the gambling problem has been arrived at by my State, Nevada. I have said that the legislature of my State, expressing the will of the people of the State, has passed a measure making the use of gambling devices legal.

MANY PROBLEMS STILL TO BE SOLVED

Over the years there has been considerable question in regard to gambling, liquor, and various other problems in the States and cities.

An examination of the statutes of the States will reveal, I believe, that they have endeavored in different ways to

solve these questions. However, so far as I know, this is the first time an attempt has been made by the Congress of the United States to nullify a State statute. I say this with all due respect to the distinguished senior Senator from Colorado, who referred to the Dyer Act, the Mann Act, and other acts which have nothing whatever to do with this proposed act, because none of the other statutes he has named nullified the law of any State.

So far as I know it never was legal in any State for a person to steal an automobile. Therefore, the Federal law making it illegal for a stolen automobile to be transported across State lines was merely a help to the States in enforcing their own laws.

ATTORNEY GENERAL WORDING OF PROPOSED  
STATUTE APPROVED

If the Senator from Colorado would agree to have this measure worded as was proposed by the Attorney General of the United States, so that it would not be necessary for the Legislature of Nevada to pass another act similar to the one which was passed by the State legislature 20 years ago, the situation would be different and no objection would be entered.

COOPERATE TO WORK OUT A SUITABLE BILL

If this conference report is returned to the conferees, the junior Senator from Nevada would be willing to confer with the conferees and work out something which will be entirely satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States and still not nullify a legal act of the legislature of any State. Furthermore, Mr. President, if during this short time it is impossible for us to arrive at a measure which will be satisfactory to all concerned, the junior Senator from Nevada has expressed a willingness, immediately upon the convening of the next Congress, to confer with the senior Senator from Colorado or his committee or any other committee, and with the Attorney General, if he wishes and work out a suitable measure.

ACT RECOMMENDED BY ATTORNEY GENERAL NOT  
OPPOSED

Mr. President, the measure recommended by the Attorney General of the United States was not opposed. That measure provided that it would be necessary for the Governor of any of the States, including my own State, to certify to the Attorney General of the United States that the use of such gambling devices was legal in his State. No one objects to a measure of that kind.

However, the junior Senator from Nevada does object when such measure is perverted to nullify a 20-year-old statute in his own State.

May I remind my colleagues that the Attorney General is committed to the bill as it was passed by the Senate.

Now to attempt to nullify an established statute of any State I think is highly improper. I think it is time for the Senate to take cognizance of all such proposed legislation.

PROBABLY NOT LAST STATE AFFECTED

When the law was passed in Nevada, within the framework of the Constitution of Nevada and within the frame-

work of the Constitution of the United States, the State legislature was acting in carrying out the will of the people of Nevada.

Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate that although Nevada may be the first State so affected, it probably will not be the last one, if the step now proposed is taken.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT TO SENATE-HOUSE  
CONFEREES

Mr. President, at this time I move that the conference report on Senate bill 3357 be recommitted to the Senate-House conferees, with instructions to the Senate conferees to disagree with the House amendments, and to insist upon the bill as previously passed by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHAPMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. MALONE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to be recognized in my own right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does that mean that the junior Senator from Nevada now loses the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Nevada to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MALONE. I withdraw the suggestion.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have propounded a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does this mean that the junior Senator from Nevada now loses the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator yielded the floor?

Mr. MALONE. I intended to yield to the Senator from North Dakota, without losing the floor, but I now relinquish the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I do not think it is good policy for Senators to continually farm out the time on the floor to other Senators, and I would object to that. The Senator from Nevada made a motion; and, when a Senator makes a motion, he loses the floor, of course. If the Senator from North Dakota has the floor, I do not see any point in having the Senator from Nevada yield to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has been recognized.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY—  
ATTITUDE OF GERMANS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at the time the Senate debated the question of approving the Charter of the United Nations, I opposed it. I believe I am today the only Senator upon the floor who was against approval of the Charter at

that time. I wish to call the attention of the Senate to a part of my speech upon that occasion. I said I was opposed to adoption of the United Nations Charter, and as shown by page 8188 of the RECORD of July 28, 1945, I said:

I would be willing to vote for the appropriation of the last dollar in the United States Treasury, and the last dollar we could borrow if, by spending that money, we could eliminate war, which we all abhor and hate. I would unhesitatingly vote for the Charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a permanent peace. But, in spite of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the Charter—and make sure we are going to implement it—will mean perpetuating war.

I repeat the words "would mean perpetuating war." I continued:

I feel it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

Quoting further:

Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Charter will be one step more toward compulsory military conscription, and all that which goes with war.

Mr. President, I submit that what I prophesied on that occasion has come true. What I am particularly concerned with is not Asia, because, bad as is the situation in Asia today, the situation is much worse in Europe.

Today the situation in Germany, for instance, needs immediate and constructive attention. When the victorious American and allied armies entered southern Germany they were hailed as long-awaited liberators, who would free the German people, not only from invasion by communism, but also from oppression by nazism. The German people were disappointed when they learned that unconditional surrender by them meant not only surrender of the Hitler government but of all the German people.

Mr. President, when the Americans approached Germany the German and Austrian people climbed to the roofs of their houses to wave their white shirts and white rags in celebration of the fact that, at last, their friends, the Americans, even though they had been fighting them for many months, were now coming in to take charge of the enemy in Berlin. I think every Senator knows what happened—that the Government of the United States permitted Russia and Joe Stalin to place an iron ring, not only around Berlin but also around the earth. Today Members of this body may wonder whether the German people are going to take up arms against Russia, whether Western Germany is to be included, in truth and in fact, as well as in the matter of arms, in the Atlantic Pact.

Today, across the water, Mr. Acheson, representing our Government, meeting there with other representatives of the Atlantic Pact, face as their chief problem the question of whether Germans are to be integrated as a part of the force to fight the Communists. In the newspaper this morning it was stated that if the United States remained in Asia, and if the forces in Japan and the Chinese Nationalists were allowed to help, it would mean a 30-years' war.



So when I said that if we adopted the United Nations Charter it would mean perpetual war, I uttered a prophecy which has come true.

What we are all concerned about today is the situation in Europe. When we speak of Europe, I think of the words of Gen. Omar Bradley, who said that the people of Germany were the crux of the entire European situation.

Mr. President, after the war the principle of collective guilt was used in dealing with the German people. They accepted it, especially after learning of the crimes against humanity which had been committed by the Nazi government against the Jews, the Catholics, and the Lutherans. In their present status, however, the German people feel that they have suffered their humiliation, that they have paid a sufficient price for the sins of the Nazi leaders in this world of confusion, when so many wrongs were committed by people who sat in judgment on the rest of mankind. The Germans feel that they, too, have a right to live again as a free and self-supporting people.

I go into this in some detail because so many Senators have asked me to speak upon the floor and to give the results of my journey in Europe, where I went at my own expense, entirely apart from the military, entirely apart from the Department of State, and merely as one United States Senator who wanted to find out what the real situation was. I was peculiarly fitted for that task, Mr. President, because, as Senators I know, I speak the German language. I could wander about in a most unobtrusive manner talking with people, trying to arrive at their true inward feeling. I say that the proof that the majority of the Germans never approved of the Nazi policy is the well-known fact that Hitler could rule only by police-enforced dictatorship.

Mr. President, as I proceed I think I shall make it abundantly clear that ever since we got into World War II, all through that war, and in all the years after that war, all the 5 years after it, our Government has made every mistake it could possibly make. I do not know of a single one it missed. I invite attention to the fact that it is not only the Democrats who are responsible. Oh, no, Mr. President. Republicans rise today and shout to high Heaven against the administration. They can call Mr. Acheson all the names they want to call him, and they can, as was done last week, with only five of us in the Republican caucus voting against them, stick a knife into the back of Mr. Acheson. We send him across the water discredited in every way in which the Republican Party could discredit him. But the truth of the matter is that during that entire time we had a bipartisan foreign policy. During the Eightieth Congress the record shows every single vote of the 13 members of that committee was unanimous. That is a fact, Mr. President.

I know that I was the only sinner upon the floor who voted against the confirmation of Mr. Stettinius. The 3-hour talk I delivered upon that occasion was entirely in vain; but it was under his architecture and that of Alger Hiss that at San Francisco the United Nations

Charter, with a veto power included at the request of the American and English representatives, was adopted and submitted to this body.

Who, Mr. President, gave the most eloquent speeches in favor of its adoption with the veto power included? It was Senators on the Republican side of the aisle. Some of my Democratic colleagues rose and said, "Under the United Nations Charter it is impossible to get into a war because the United States has not surrendered a single shred of its sovereignty." But we are in a war, Mr. President; we are in a war up to our necks. Only an hour and a half or two hours ago upon this floor we heard the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] say that never in all the history of the United States, certainly during the 40 years he has been a Member of the Congress, has our Government faced a more critical situation. In part that critical situation arises from our treatment of Germany and Austria. Something which was entirely and unanimously ignored by the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, and ignored by our Department of State was that the majority of the Germans never approved of the Nazi policy, and it is a well-known fact that Hitler could rule only by police-enforced dictatorship. However, representatives of the State Department, our national administration, and the members of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate stood idly by and did nothing. Now when we are face to face with a crisis, they try to blame Secretary Acheson.

I invite the attention of my fellow Senators, Mr. President, to the fact that I was one of six Senators who voted against the confirmation of Mr. Acheson. But I do not propose to sit idly by and see any group of Senators, whether they are on the Democratic or Republican side, make a goat of Mr. Acheson when he is not to blame. Mr. Acheson, in my opinion, is no more guilty than are some of the very Republicans who stuck a knife into his back last week.

In Germany, Mr. President, children are growing up, and their parents feel that at least they should not be condemned or punished for the political mistakes of the past. I found that the Germans are a proud people, too proud to parade their poverty publicly or to be beggars at their neighbors' doors. They are also a conservative and industrious people. I submit that the 33,000,000 Americans who are of Teutonic origin, set an example for industry, for thrift, for being law-abiding citizens, and for being good, patriotic Americans. Millions of persons in Germany are relatives of the millions in this country, and they are very much alike.

As I judge the picture, the Germans over there realize the present political situations in the world. They know there can be no compromise between the dictatorship of communism and the rights and freedoms of democracy. The great majority of the German people want three things: Political independence, religious freedom, and the right to earn a decent living. Complete political independence for Germany at this time is dangerous. They feel it might aggra-

vate Russia into a war in Europe, and it would surely lead to disagreements among our allies.

Religious freedom has been granted to the Germans in the western zone. It might be said, however, that our interpretation of the complete separation of church and state in connection with the administration of the McCloy funds is causing much misunderstanding, because in Germany the social and charitable work which is carried on is so much a part of organizations that are definitely either Catholic or Lutheran. There is no quarrel between these two groups, but they often find themselves excluded in favor of some new nonreligious organization that calls itself liberal. The Germans feel that, although unintentionally, we are nevertheless, at least indirectly, interfering in the religious life in Germany. I think it is very important that the persons in charge of administering the McCloy funds should be given much broader power in favor of religious groups who are doing social work, the rule being that all moneys allotted must be used for social and charitable work and not for purely religious purposes.

Within the realm of immediate possibility, then, there is a third desire of the Germans, namely, to earn a decent living. At the present time, and under the present set-up, it is entirely impossible for too large a proportion of Germans in the western zone to earn a decent living. What are the reasons why Germans cannot earn a decent living? First, a large percentage of the factories have been destroyed in the war or were dismantled after the war, with the result that entire towns, in some cases, were left without any work possibilities. Second, 40 percent of the houses were completely destroyed, many more damaged by war. The victims who survived had to seek refuge in the country, where there was no work for them.

Third, into such a disturbed economy of Western Germany more than 12,000,000 German expellees were driven, robbed of their homes, their possessions, coming often with only the clothes on their bodies, with no kitchen utensils, no bedding, no provisions of any kind; thousands of them sick. Hundreds of thousands of the men who belonged to these refugee families had been kept back in slavery to work the farms and factories they had owned or to be sent as slaves into the mines and into Siberia. Even if Western Germany had not lost 40 percent of its housing it would have required 1,200,000 new dwelling units to take care of the expellees.

The International Refugee Organization refused to lend any assistance, not only to the Germans driven out of former German territory, but also to the millions of Germans who were ethnic Germans, driven from their homes in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and other Balkan countries and from the Baltic states. These ethnic Germans had never been citizens of the German state, but still they were dispossessed and persecuted, and the International Refugee Organization refused to take any responsibility for them. The shattered economy of present Western Ger-

many had to accept more than 10,000,-000 of these unfortunate people.

Thank God, the charity of American people, in response to the appeals of Jewish, Catholics, and Protestant organizations, did much to relieve the sufferings imposed by the political policies of the victors in the war. May I say here that only this charity, consisting of hundreds of millions of dollars, saved the 70,000,000 Germans from spiritual despair and physical starvation.

Every Senator should realize the desperate plight of the German people at that particular time.

Marshall plan aid, given for diplomatic reasons, would have been much too late had it not been for this charity, inspired by religious motives. The German people are deeply appreciative of this charity. But the time has come when they ask for an economic arrangement that will permit them to live by the work of their hands and talents. They refuse communism, they wish to be accepted again into the family of democratic nations. If we refuse this request we shall strive in vain to save Europe from disaster, in spite of the billions we have given to England, France, Italy, and other European countries. It is only in Germany and Austria that communism can be stopped from conquering all of Europe. In saying it, I emphatically endorse what was said by Gen. Omar Bradley only a few weeks ago.

The free and democratic powers need the assistance of the German and Austrian peoples. The effective assistance of these people can be had for the investment of a sum of money that is insignificant compared to the billions we are voting for the equipment of American and other armies that are to fight the aggression of communism. Yet, the investment we make in the Western German and Austrian economy today are as much a part of our defense program as the billions of dollars spent for guns and airplanes. The German and Austrian people will be our strongest allies in the fight we are waging, but we must give them economic assistance to permit them to live decently. We must give to the present Governments of Germany and Austria, limited as they are, a political prestige with their own people so that these Governments show to their people that cooperation with the democracies is really their only hope to reestablish themselves in the family of democratic nations. We must give to the present German and Austrian Governments the economic assistance necessary to give homes and jobs to the millions of expellees we helped to force upon them, because in the Potsdam Agreement we did give sanction to a migration of people that, under Russian-inspired brutality, turned out to be the largest and most inhuman forced migration in the history of mankind.

In all the history of the world, Mr. President, there has never been anything like it heretofore. The signing of the Potsdam agreement sent 15,000,000 people into slavery. Abraham Lincoln, whose picture hangs on the wall of this Chamber, would turn over in his grave if he knew that a President of the United States had signed an agreement which

sent 15,000,000 people into the most inhuman forced migration and slavery in the history of mankind.

We need not be too worried about the votes against rearmament that we so recently witnessed in southern Germany. The German and Austrian people live in daily fear of a Russian invasion. They cannot and will not vote to take up arms unless and until there is a real hope that the Russian armies will be stopped at the German and Austrian borders. At present, even a token membership of Germans in a European army would give the long looked-for excuse that Russia wants for invading Western Germany. The recent voting in southern Germany was against a rearmament they consider inefficient and dangerous. This was the first opportunity the expellees had to register their demand for a place to live and work in this changed Europe. We know from their history that these expellees are a conservative people. They are people of Yugoslavia and of Rumania who were living there for hundreds of years. Tito comes along. He is the man to whom we voted millions of dollars a few days ago. Tito and his Government wanted those farms. So they walked in and took them. If the man in charge of a farm did not want to give it up he was killed. They took the wives and children of those farmers and drove them out of the country and into Germany. Now they have nationalized the farms.

When the peasants did not raise enough food, what happened? The propagandists said there was a drought, and that good old Uncle Sam should send millions of dollars to feed the people. So we find the United States Government lining up with those scoundrels, those crooks, those Communists. Hard working heads of families have been deprived of their farms; and when the patriotic peasants and farmers would not raise a crop, the people of the United States were taxed to send them food, and to back up everything that Tito had done. That is why the senior Senator from North Dakota did not vote for aid to Yugoslavia. In my opinion it is a good, sound, unanswerable reason.

Those families were driven from their homes, away from their churches, away from their schools. Where are they today? We have heard a great deal of the displaced persons; but the situation of these millions of people is just as bad as the worst we have ever heard about displaced persons. I saw them. They live in single rooms, three or four families in a room. They live in camps and shacks. Children are without proper food, and are getting no education. How can they when the heads of families are without work and fathers and mothers see no hope of reestablishing a home? When that is the situation, ballots will be cast in protest, even by a conservative people. Let us never forget, Mr. President, that every expellee who comes into Germany is automatically a citizen, with the right to vote. That is why 3 weeks ago yesterday in Hesse, and in Württemberg, Baden, and 2 weeks ago yesterday in Bavaria, we found Social Democrats for the first time in history gaining an overwhelming victory at the polls. In

Bavaria for the first time we found an almost solid phalanx of Social Democrats, getting more votes than any other party.

All our millions of dollars spent to advocate democracy will do little good if we fail to offer hope of jobs and homes. If we now build up Western Germany and Austria economically it will be the source of internal physical strength and political unity that we shall need far more than any presently contemplated small German army in the event that Russia attacks democratic Europe. If the Russian attack comes, in spite of all our efforts to keep the peace, every German and Austrian possible will march with us in the battle which will decide the future of the world.

Let me repeat the warning that if Western Germany should fall a victim to Russia, the hundreds of millions of dollars which we have spent in France, Italy, and England will have been spent in vain, for those nations, too, will fall before Communist aggression.

The Voice of America speaks in vain to the Germans in the Russian zone and to the oppressed people in Russian satellite countries unless it can not only tell of freedom in distant democratic countries, but point to liberties, food, and homes gained by the people of Western Germany and Austria who have been associated with the Western democracies. American fathers and mothers would much rather give money than sacrifice the lives of their sons and daughters in this battle for freedom and human rights. I wish to say publicly, not only to Members of the Senate, but to the American people, that helping Western Germany and Austria to take care of millions of homeless expellees will save American lives, and it should be a part of our present defense program.

Mr. President, let me sound a final warning. If we refuse the necessary assistance to the present conservative governments in Western Germany which support democratic institutions, we shall play into the hands of the smaller radical groups who are now attempting to unite their forces. They call it the German neutrality movement. Should this group attain power they will negotiate a modus vivendi with Russia. Then again we shall see in all Germany a dictatorship of the minority, as we already see it in Eastern Germany, supported by Russia. That will end all hope of a free and prosperous Europe.

Have we not learned a lesson from the mistakes of England and France when they refused the help which Chancellor Bruening asked for a few years ago? Have we not learned a lesson from our own recent mistakes in China? What we need today is not revolution, destroying the good with the bad, not restoration, which returns the evil with the good, but a renovation—building a new world order on social justice, economic security, and religious freedom. This renovation in the world order must include Western Germany and Austria.

Specifically, I should like to go into detail as to some of the things which have taken place in Germany during the past 5 years. Why is it that our American Government has been helping the



Communists over there rather than the German people?

There has been much discussion, both pro and con, with respect to the war-crimes trials which we held in Nuremberg. I am not now speaking of the first Nuremberg trials, in which the Russians openly participated, to try Goering and the other Nazi leaders. I am speaking of the subsequent war-crimes trials, which were conducted by American judges, under American law written especially for the purpose. The prosecutors were Americans. Let me repeat, Mr. President, that I am speaking not about the first Nuremberg trials, where Goering and his associates were tried. I am speaking of the subsequent war-crimes trials, which were conducted by American judges, under American laws written especially for the purpose. The cases were prosecuted by American prosecutors and defended only by German lawyers. One of our fundamental principles of justice is that the accused has the right to select his own lawyer, and that if he is denied the right to select his own counsel he cannot be said to have had a fair trial, as we in this country understand fair trials.

Mr. President, the very German men the Senate want to fight alongside our boys against Russia and at whom the Senate wonders because they do not wish to do so, as it wonders why in the last three elections the vote has been against America—those very German men are now talking and complaining about the war-crimes trials.

At those war-crimes trials, when some of the defendants asked for American lawyers to defend them in American courts, since they were tried by American prosecutors, before American judges, their requests were refused. What do Senators think of that? What did the Foreign Relations Committee do, Republicans and Democrats alike, when that was going on? The matter was brought to the attention of the members of that committee. But what did the great Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate do?

The refusals were generally by the prosecution. This is not to say that the German lawyers, counsel in these cases, were not able. Generally, the people over there believe that the German lawyers were men of high intellectual and legal ability. But they were Germans and treated as such by the Americans, who were very conscious of the fact that America was victorious in the war.

Moreover, the rules under which the defendants were tried were not the rules and laws prevailing in Germany, but were the rules written specifically for the purpose of the trials. Though the laws were drafted by Americans they did not follow American standards of procedure at all. Again I repeat, I am not talking about the first trials. I am talking about the trials of the great masses of German citizens who were arrested. Certain as it is that the sun rises in the east and sets in the west, so some day in the future American boys and American girls are going to pay the penalty for what has been done.

Mr. President, in this country, we do not permit ex post facto laws, but in

Nuremberg such laws were permitted to be made use of. Here we demand that the accused shall have the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him. The most humble man or woman in this country arrested for stealing a bicycle, has, under our Constitution, the right to be confronted with the witnesses against him or her. In this country we allow no hearsay evidence in a criminal case. At Nuremberg the American prosecutors were allowed to and did use affidavits, some containing hearsay evidence, or being based on hearsay evidence. Then we wonder why the Germans do not want to fight alongside us.

Living accommodations in Nuremberg were luxurious for the prosecutors and inadequate for the German defense lawyers. That is what the Germans over there tell us, Mr. President. Though in a case before the court all the lawyers were supposed to be treated equally, at Nuremberg in many respects the German counsel were not treated with the same consideration accorded American counsel. At Nuremberg the American Chief of Counsel was also the Federal administrative officer of the court. Thus the prosecutor was in the position to favor its side, and to hamstring the defense by such devices as failing to produce evidentiary material in its possession, which had been demanded by the defense, or pretending not to be able to locate such material.

Here at home it is unthinkable for men to be tried for crimes and not to be given the chance to point out errors in the trial by an appeal to a higher court. At Nuremberg no appeal or revision was permitted.

How do Senators who are now begging German men to join in the fight like the position those Germans are taking? Perhaps the final answer will not be given in their own lifetimes, but their sons and their daughters are going to be given the answer.

The judgment of the trial court was final. If after the trial, the defense located material evidence which would have aided the defense, it was too late, and it was just too bad for the defense. Of course, we are told that there was an administrative review by the military.

However, since the prosecution was by the military the mechanics of an administrative review must give an obvious appearance of inadequate consideration of possible errors at the trial when contrasted with a judicial review of such errors. As one of the trial judges said:

In many instances practices have been followed that were not in keeping with our generally accepted concepts of proper administration of justice.

Someone has tried to justify the war-crimes trials as being intended to deter future aggressors. It was said, "We will set such examples, that there will be no more aggressors in the future. We will set an example right here." But today, Mr. President, with our boys dying in Korea we see how ridiculous such a declaration is. The Nuremberg trials have not deterred the Reds in Korea.

These war-crime trials were decided on in Moscow and they were carried on under Moscow principles. These trials

were essentially the same as the mass trials held in the 1930's by Stalin when Vishinsky used treason trials to liquidate Stalin's opposition. In Russia Stalin used such trials to liquidate his internal enemies. At Nuremberg the Communists used the war crimes trials to liquidate their external enemies.

It is the Communist's avowed purpose to destroy the Western World which is based on property rights. The war crimes trials were aimed directly at property rights. It was intended to try the accused as aggressors, convict them as having started the war, and then confiscate their property as a penalty.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I am interested in the discussion by the Senator, but I notice that repeatedly he has stated that he wants to differentiate between the first Nuremberg trials and the latter Nuremberg trials. I think it would be enlightening to the Senate if the Senator would tell us why he differentiates between them. In other words, why does he differentiate between the first Nuremberg trials and the later Nuremberg trials?

Mr. LANGER. The first Nuremberg trials were tried by Allied courts. The first Nuremberg trials were tried by judges from England, Russia, and other countries. The other trials were conducted by American judges and American prosecutors according to American laws specifically enacted for that purpose. The difference between them was as great as the difference between day and night. For the second Nuremberg trials we sent from all over the United States judges to try between 2,000,000 and 3,000,000 Germans who were arrested and tried at what were called the denazification trials.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEHMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LANGER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Is it not true that we sent some of the highest legal authorities in this country to participate in the first Nuremberg trials?

Mr. LANGER. At the first Nuremberg trials, we were represented by Mr. Biddle, our former Attorney General, who was sent there to be one of the trial justices. We were also represented by Mr. Robert H. Jackson, who went there to be the chief prosecutor. At that time he was one of the associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States.

However, that system was not followed at the second Nuremberg denazification trials. At that time all the judges and all the prosecutors were Americans.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I may have misunderstood what the Senator from North Dakota said, but I thought he said that the first Nuremberg trials were tried under Soviet Russia.

Mr. LANGER. No; the Senator from Nevada most certainly misunderstood me. I shall repeat what I said. I said that the war-crimes trials were decided

on in Moscow and were carried on under Moscow principles.

Mr. McCARRAN. In that connection, does the Senator distinguish between the first Nuremberg trials and the later Nuremberg trials?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. In other words, according to the idea of the Senator from North Dakota, the first Nuremberg trials were carried on under the American system of jurisprudence; is that correct?

Mr. LANGER. They were carried on under the joint jurisdiction of the Allies.

Mr. McCARRAN. Was not Russia included?

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Did not Russia dominate there?

Mr. LANGER. I would not say Russia took any greater part than did any other of the Allies. I said that the subsequent Nuremberg trials, the war-crimes trials, were decided on in Moscow and were carried on under Moscow principles. Let me point out that when I speak of "principles" in that connection, I am using the word which is spelled "p-r-i-n-c-i-p-l-e-s," rather than the word "p-r-i-n-c-i-p-a-l-s."

Mr. President, as I have said, those trials were essentially the same as the mass trials which were held in the 1930's by Stalin, when Vishinsky used treason trials to liquidate Stalin's opposition. In Russia, Stalin used such trials to liquidate his internal enemies. At Nuremberg the Communists used the war-crimes trials to liquidate their external enemies.

It is the Communists' avowed purpose to destroy the Western World, which is based on property rights. The war-crimes trials were aimed at property rights. It was intended to try the accused as aggressors, convict them of having started a war, and then confiscate their property as a penalty. Thus Moscow hoped to give a death blow to the capitalistic system. Our fellow-travelers and pro-Communist stooges were the dupes, and in some cases were the willing helpers.

Mr. President, in view of the questions my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nevada, has asked, I want him to listen carefully to what I shall say now: If there be any doubt that the war-crimes trials served the purposes of Russia, and did not serve the interests of the West, we need only ask who approved those trials. Senators will find that those war-crimes trials have been most ardently supported by Communist-front organizations, and that the same organizations have been most active in objecting to review by the Clemency Board appointed by High Commissioner McCloy of the errors committed during those trials.

At the original Nuremberg trial, the Russians openly participated. In that case they tried, but failed in the attempt, to establish that the industrialists had been guilty of starting the war. The Russians tried again, during the war-crimes trials, which were held by Americans only. That did not prevent some of the prosecution staff from collaborating with the Russians, with whom they were ideologically in accord. Again the

Russians tried to establish that the industrialists as a group, and individually, were guilty of starting the war. Again they failed. In the trials of the industrialists, all the defendants were acquitted of the charge of having committed crimes against the peace. Despite that, the Communist-front organizations and their stooges continued to denounce those industrialists as war-mongers. That charge, a pure Moscow invention, is particularly ironic today when we see what is going on in Korea, and when we consider who is responsible. Yet the Moscow stooges have not hesitated to send telegrams of protest to President Truman and High Commissioner McCloy, when he recently released some of the men convicted of war crimes, after the Clemency Board had examined the cases and recommended their release.

I hope my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nevada, will listen carefully, because some 2 weeks ago I submitted a resolution, which now is before his committee, calling for an investigation of the part the Communists played in the Nuremberg war-crimes trials, after the first Nuremberg trials were held.

If the payrolls of the Nuernberg prosecution staff are subpoenaed by the Judiciary Committee, headed by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, it will be seen that practically the entire prosecution staff was composed of leftists and men who since then have been exposed as Communists and members of Communist-front organizations. They were, and still are, leftists. The tactics they pursued at Nuremberg were partisan. They were not the sort of tactics we expect to see followed in an American courtroom. They acted under the Moscow principle that the state can do anything to its enemies, and they decided who were those enemies. They were actuated by personal motives, in many cases. Typical was Prosecutor Rapp, in case 12; in a radio address he declared that, as far as he was concerned, his purpose was to tear the masks from the faces of the generals, and that such men could no longer be considered as leaders; that that was his hobby, and was what he intended to prove.

Obviously when the prosecution was composed of men who had such bias, impartial justice could not prevail. That situation and the result were deplorable.

Mr. President, I say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that when the committee holds its hearings, I shall be very glad to have the committee subpoena the necessary witnesses and have them brought before the committee, and subpoena the payrolls and investigate the names appearing on them, for some of those persons have been Communists and some have been called such by various newspapers in the United States. Regardless of that fact, those persons were called to help in that prosecution.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am most interested in what the Senator has had to say, in view of his vote on the Internal Security Act of 1950.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, if my distinguished friend will wait, I will discuss that with him. I say that because I am afraid my distinguished friend may leave the Chamber while I am speaking.

Let me say that one of the most terrible things that ever happened was the passage by the Senate of the Internal Security Act of 1950, for that act resulted in wrecking the good will on the part of the people of Germany and Austria for the United States, good will which the administration for months and years had built up. No unprejudiced man, who went to those countries, as I did, could help but feel sorrowful at the terrible effect that act had upon the people of Germany and Austria. The American consuls over there told me that before that act was passed 1 out of every 10 persons who applied for a visa to come to the United States was able to obtain one, but that after the passage of that act only 1 out of every 90 persons who tried to get a visa to come to the United States was able to obtain one.

However, that is not all. Mind you, Mr. President, more than 200,000 of those persons had applied to come to the United States, under the quotas; but following the passage of that act, their visas were canceled. Why was that done? At one time at Ellis Island, 1,200 persons were stopped. Some of them were the brides of American soldiers. Some of them had sold their furniture. Many of them had given up their jobs to come here. They were stopped at Ellis Island as the result of passage of the Internal Security Act. After I reached Europe—and I had with me the veto message of President Truman—I said, "How could any man in the United States Senate vote against the President on a measure of this kind?" Here was the President of the United States vetoing the act. What did he do? Whom did he consult? He called in representatives of the Central Intelligence Agency, upon which we spend millions of dollars. The CIA had men in Russia, particularly in Moscow, and they had them in every other country. I met with some of them in Germany and Austria. They said to me, "How in heaven's name could such an act be passed?" I talked with the High Commissioners in Germany and Austria, and they said, "The act has done irreparable injury to the friendly relations existing between the peoples of Austria and Germany and the people of America." In spite of the information furnished by the Central Intelligence Agency and by the representatives of the Department of State, whose ambassadors are in every country, Members of the Senate, three of them at least, have since come to me and said they did not know what in the world they were voting upon. One of them, after he had voted, said to me, "Bill, who are the Volks-deutsche?" He did not even know who they were.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator not know that the Security Act was prepared and passed for the security of America, not for the security of foreign



countries? If the Senator is now arguing for the security of foreign countries, he is addressing himself to something other than the internal security of the United States in 1950.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator said that, because in my opinion it shows the great ignorance of so many people in America as to where the real security of this country lies. I read a speech by General Omar Bradley, in which he said that the real security of America lies in Germany and in Austria.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry to say—

Mr. LANGER. I decline to yield until I have finished. He said, "We have got to have the Germans integrated as a part of our defense of this country." The relationships, in Germany and Austria, according to Mr. McCloy and Mr. Donnelly, were unusually friendly. They were getting along beautifully with those people. Friends of those people had come to America, and more were coming. Relationships were fine. Upon the passage of that act, visas were immediately cancelled, and, as the Senator well knows, thousands and thousands of people were denied admission. It immediately created ill feeling. Mr. President, what would you think if a GI who had fought for 4 years for us and who had married a German girl, and had made all the arrangements to bring her here, suddenly, overnight, found that he could not bring her into this country?

Mr. McCARRAN. But who has the right of determining who shall come into this country—Germany or America?

Mr. LANGER. America, of course.

Mr. McCARRAN. We determined it. But now the Senator from North Dakota wants Germany to determine who shall be admitted.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota wants no such thing. The Senator from North Dakota made his position plain for 2½ years on the very committee of which the Senator is chairman. Time and time again I made my position clear. I was one of those who voted to send the Senator, himself, to Europe, where he spent 2 or 3 months. Let me remind the Senator—although he may have conveniently forgotten it—it was the Senator from North Dakota who backed the Senator when the Senator returned from his European trip. I stood upon the Senate floor to back the Senator in connection with the displaced-persons bill. No one was more eager to provide security for America than the Senator from North Dakota, and, in my opinion, the Senator from Nevada. We fought shoulder to shoulder in that fight, from beginning to end.

The Senator from North Dakota is just as sincere in desiring a continuance of friendly relations with the people of Germany and Austria, whom we need in this battle, according to Gen. Omar Bradley, as is the Senator from Nevada. Certainly, I would never vote for a bill which the President of the United States, in his veto message, in my opinion, clearly demonstrated would do more good than harm to the Communists. That was my opinion. The Senator from Nevada has the right to his opinion.

I am not disputing that at all. But I still say that in that veto message, when the President said, "We have 27 laws now dealing with Communists, and we already have 3 more pending, which, if adopted, will solve this entire problem," I still think, in my humble judgment, the President was absolutely right.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator, in giving his excuse, in connection with the vote on the veto message, said that the reason he voted against the bill was so that he would be in a position to move to reconsider.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator will remember that the Senator from North Dakota did not vote until the remainder of the entire membership of the Senate had voted. Then what? I voted for the bill—that is, for the Kilgore substitute. Never forget that it was for the Kilgore substitute that I voted. I said I did so because I wanted to move to reconsider. When the bill came up, and when the Kilgore substitute and all the others were gathered together and put into one package, I was one who spoke against that. I had intended to vote against it, but unfortunately I was in the hospital and did not have an opportunity to vote.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not think the Senator from North Dakota was present when the Kilgore substitute was presented, because it was about 12:30 at night.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from North Dakota was not only present, but actually voted for it. The Record will show I voted for it.

Mr. McCARRAN. What I have in mind is this: I am not criticizing the vote of the Senator, but I am criticizing the fact that the Senator now raises a question about the law, after having told the Senate that his reason for not voting was that he wanted to move a reconsideration. However, he did not move a reconsideration.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is entirely wrong. The Record will speak for itself. The Record will show that I voted for the Kilgore substitute. I was present and voted for it. Afterwards, when all the bills were joined together, and when the one-package bill came up, I unfortunately was in the hospital. I had spoken against that bill. I was unable to be present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to agree with the Senator—he did support me when I was absent, after he had voted to permit me to go to Europe. I am grateful for his vote.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has been most consistent with me during the years that I have been chairman, and I appreciate his consistency. But, now and then even consistency becomes a little off balance.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the distinguished Senator. I tried to do the best I could on the committee. I hope that at least for a part of the time I was right. Babe Ruth's batting average was only 400. I doubt that I can excel Babe Ruth's average.

I desire to continue with my statement. I was discussing the effect of the Nuremberg trials, and I am not talking about the first trial, where judges from various countries sat, but the one where we had American judges and American prosecutors. Here is what the Germans think about it.

We had hoped that these trials would demonstrate to the Germans the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon way of life and system of justice. Actually the Nuremberg trials have had a tremendous effect on the Germans, but not the effect that was supposedly intended. The Germans know that their leaders were tried for crimes against humanity, including the torture of Germans by Germans. The Germans also know that the Soviet Union has tortured, imprisoned and murdered many times more men than Hitler did, and that nobody has been tried for such crimes against humanity as the murder of some 4,000 Polish officers in Katyn Forest. German generals were tried for rounding up Russian partisans who were interfering with their lines of communication. These generals are supposed to have rounded up these men primarily for the purpose of using them as slave labor. Yet no Russian general has been punished for seizing thousands of German laborers from the east zone. Nor has any American been punished for the inhumanity to man to which thousands of German civilians and war prisoners were subjected by British and American Armed Forces right after the termination of war.

It is now realized fairly generally that the war crimes trials stand in the way of inducing Germans today to be willing to fight on our side against Russia. Thus the trials have resulted in helping Russia and hindering the United States.

The purpose of Moscow for years has been the destruction of the west. Any means, fair or foul, are used. The Kremlin has no ethics; it wants only destruction of its enemy. The Nuremberg trials have helped toward that end. The opposition of the Germans to Russia and to communism centered in its leaders, in its officials, and government workers. To remove political leaders and able and experienced officers in government and big business, automatically weakens the government apparatus in the opponent country, and of course it makes it that much harder for such country to recover. All this serves the interest of Moscow. It does not serve the interests of the United States, which has been compelled to pump money into the German economy to undo the mistakes made at Potsdam.

The war crimes trials were a breach of a long historical tradition of the West. In the past, wars ended with an armistice, which was followed by a peace conference and a peace treaty. In 1918 there was talk of trying the Kaiser as a war criminal. Balfour, of England, questioned whether such trials could be just,

and said that neutral judges would have to sit on the court if the world was to be convinced that justice had been done. If the court was composed only of members of the victorious powers, it would be difficult to convince the world that the trials were impartial. Our Secretary Lansing in 1919 refused to issue a list of war criminals who were to be held responsible for the war on the ground that nobody could be tried under this particular charge. Lansing held that the accused could not be tried legally because they were only morally guilty. There was no law which made their actions a crime. In those days the world was conservative, and Moscow was struggling for existence. Moscow has become of age. The bear's appetite has grown with eating. Those who opposed the expansion of Russia, who honestly thought they were defending their country against the Communists, are now accused and tried as war criminals. Again, no one tries the Politburo for doing the same thing for which we have tried and convicted Germans at Nuremberg. The world thus has a clear demonstration that guilt is relative, and that if the criminal is big and powerful enough nothing will happen to him.

Hitler systematically undermined all previous concepts of justice in Germany. We held that this was wrong and fought and defeated Hitler and the Nazis so as to demonstrate that our system was superior. We held the war crimes trials despite the skepticism expressed by leading authorities because we hoped thus to demonstrate the superiority of our concept of justice. Had these trials been conducted by high-caliber men, men motivated by ideals and not by ambition, perhaps we might have succeeded in our purpose. But these trials were not held by men of high ideals. They were run by men animated by ambition or vindictiveness or both. The high purposes have been perverted. The result has been catastrophic.

The Russians are the only ones who profit, because they never have made any pretense of superiority of their system of justice. They have simply liquidated their enemies and rewarded those who work with them. We have convinced the Germans that public opinion and not justice determined court decisions; that collective guilt replaced individual liability; that men have been tried as symbols for representative groups, rather than for things they individually did; that the most able men were picked and tried primarily because they had been able; that so far as the industrialists' trials were concerned, the trials had for their purpose the destruction of German competition, and crippling Germany's effectiveness in world trade for a long time to come, and last, but not least, that the trials were debased from their high purpose by letting newly made Americans of German origin participate for the purpose of personal vindictiveness and revenge.

The Nuremberg trials were sham, not genuine justice. Their purpose was to satisfy feelings of revengefulness, and to fabricate a moral justification for reparation claims, and for changing the economic and political set-up in Germany.

Under an ostensible legality the trials were in fact no different from the old-time western frontier lynchings. In Texas and in the far West in the old days it was summarized in the humorous but truthful expression: "Let's give him a fair trial and then hang him." Nuremberg in the minds of most Germans was no different. There, too, the victims were arrested and tried, but the result was often known in advance. If the prosecution had any complaint it was that the judges were not willing to go along fully, that the sentences were in some cases less than the prosecution demanded.

If the war-crimes trials were intended to deter aggressors in the future they have failed. Korea proves this. If they had been properly carried out they would no doubt have contributed further to securing the values which go to make up the American way of life, and what we call western civilization. But the spirit which animated these trials, the manner in which they were conducted, have resulted in the opposite. This should not be surprising when we consider that they served the purposes of Moscow, which is the declared enemy of all rights and values which are at the foundation of our way of life.

That we have failed in achieving the purposes for which the Nuremberg war-crimes trials were held is shown by the action of German workers employed in the Joelim & Voss shipyard, when their chief, Mr. Boehm, was tried for opposing the dismantling of the shipyard. When the defendant was asked to rise before the court pronounced sentence, all the workers in the courtroom also rose, showing that in their opinion the judgment also applied to them. By their action they in effect said: "This judgment is also directed against us." In the same manner the Nuremberg judgments also have affected unnumbered others who were not at Nuremberg, but who felt that the judgments individually affected them. And these are the men whose support we will need if we fight Russia. Certainly we need their support to oppose the growth of communism in Germany. Their support will not be had until they feel that the injustices of the Nuremberg judges are corrected in those cases where the circumstances clearly demand such correction.

Mr. President, consider the foolishness of the Nuremberg trials. Millions of Germans were denazified. All the educated ones were taken. They included scientists, school teachers, and engineers. What did Russia do? Russia had denazification trials also for 3 or 4 weeks, and then stopped. Then Russia got its Communist stooges, including some who had been on the payroll of Communist newspapers in the United States, and put them on the payroll of the United States Government. I saw some of their photographs in Germany. They participated in the trials. While Americans were saying to school teachers, scientists, and engineers, "You cannot work in schoolhouses; you will have to take a shovel and get to work in the ditches by the day," what did Russia do? I am told by Germans that they took 50,000—it may not have been as many

as that—of the leading engineers and scientists over to the east zone and put them on the Russian payroll, gave them nice homes in which to live, and said to them, "Continue to develop the submarine which Hitler started. Continue to develop the rocket which Hitler started."

I was given the name of one German scientist who refused and who was promptly executed.

Whether the Department of State is to blame I leave for the American public to judge. But, as there is a war on now with Russia, I say to the Senate of the United States, Mr. President, that some of the weapons used by Russia will be the very weapons that Hitler was fashioning at the time the war ended. Russia got hold of them because of the denazification program.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. A short time ago the Senator from North Dakota made some expressions with reference to the Internal Security Act. He was very vehement in his expressions, no doubt in keeping with his thoughts. I know that the Senator does not choose his companions.

Mr. LANGER. I do not. I believe every Senator votes according to his conscience.

Mr. McCARRAN. It may be interesting to the Senator from North Dakota to know that his expressions with reference to the Internal Security Act are adhered to by all the Communist organizations in the world today.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, all I can say is that if what the distinguished Senator from Nevada says is true—and I do not believe it is true—the previous occupant of the chair, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], would be in the same category with me. The distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] would be in the same category. So would every other Senator who voted against the Internal Security Act. Some 10 or 11 Senators voted against the act. Leaving myself out entirely, Mr. President, I believe the 10 Senators who voted against the Internal Security Act are as patriotic, as honest, and as much opposed to communism as is the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]. The Senator from New Mexico is probably the leading Catholic in the Senate. If anyone is opposed to communism certainly it is the average Catholic. The Senator from New Mexico walked into the Senate Chamber after every Senator had voted on the internal security bill, while the votes were being tallied by the clerk, and said, "Mr. President, I want to vote." The Chavez family is one of the leading Catholic families in New Mexico. It was one of the leading families in Old Mexico for 400 years. One ancestor of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico was a President of old Mexico. Another ancestor was the Governor of what is now New Mexico. From this distinguished family have come great clerics and distinguished judges.

The judgment of the Senator from New Mexico is as good as that of any



other Senator when it comes to the question of what is or is not communism or communistic. The Senator from New Mexico walked onto the floor of the Senate and said, "Mr. President, I want to vote." When his name was called he voted "nay." If the Senator from New Mexico had been the only Senator to vote against the Internal Security Act I would have said that he voted according to his conscience. He may be right or he may be wrong. The same thing applies to every other Senator. When 11 Senators vote against a bill, the fact that some Communists may agree with them is not evidence that the 11 Senators have any communistic thoughts.

Mr. President, let us take an ordinary case. I believe in the Bank of North Dakota. I believe that public money belongs to the people. I believe that money which belongs to a township, county, or State, should be put into a public bank which is owned by the people themselves. I believe that any interest paid on the money should accrue to the benefit of the people. We have such a bank in North Dakota. We have the Bank of North Dakota. I think it is wrong for a private bank to get public money and put it into its coffers. Sometimes when public money is placed in a private bank one-half of 1 percent or perhaps 1 percent interest is paid on it. The bank turns around and lends that money to the people who own it at 5, 6, 7, or 8 percent interest.

The fact that a Communist may happen to agree with me with respect to the Bank of North Dakota does not mean that I have any Communist leanings. For example, when a former colleague of the Senator from Nevada spoke in favor of gambling in Nevada, he helped his distinguished colleague. He had a perfect right to do that.

Mr. McCARRAN. What is that?

Mr. LANGER. I admire him for doing it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I cannot hear what the Senator is saying. Does the Senator say I helped gambling?

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Nevada certainly helped his former colleague, the former Senator from Nevada, Mr. Bunker, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, because the sentiments expressed by former Senator Bunker were the sentiments of the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Who?

Mr. LANGER. Former Senator Bunker. There was nothing wrong about it. I admire the Senator from Nevada for doing it, if he believed it was a good law for Nevada. If he thought so, it was his duty to speak up. Simply because some Communists—if there were any in Nevada—thought gambling was good for Nevada, we cannot criticize the Senator from Nevada, any more than we should criticize the 10 or 11 Senators who were opposed to the internal-security bill. They should not be condemned or criticized for their position because some Communists or Communist-front organizations believed as they did on the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from North Dakota misjudged what I said.

I said that the Senator from North Dakota is not a chooser of his own companions. However, the position he takes is supported by every Communist organization in the world.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, Mr. President, I cannot speak for all Communist organizations in the world, because I do not know anything about them. I do know that I have made speech after speech on the floor of the Senate—and the Senator from Nevada did not agree with me—in condemning the judges in San Francisco for letting Mr. Harry Bridges, the leading Communist, out on bail. The Senator from Nevada was opposed to me in the case of the bill I introduced. At that time the Communist-front organizations were opposed to me and were in favor of the stand taken by the Senator from Nevada. Therefore, the whole argument simmers down to—

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know what the Senator is referring to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. To what does the Senator from North Dakota refer?

Mr. LANGER. I am referring to the bill I introduced in the Senate calling for an investigation of the judges who admitted Harry Bridges to bail.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from Nevada was opposed to it? Is that what the Senator from North Dakota said?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; it is my recollection that the Senator was opposed to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is in error. Not only that, but the committee of which the Senator from Nevada is chairman voted that the Senator from Nevada should appoint a subcommittee to investigate the matter.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator from Nevada states that he was in favor of the bill, and I was delighted to hear him say so. My recollection was that he was opposed to it. However, I am delighted to hear that he joined the Senator from North Dakota in that very great work.

Mr. McCARRAN. He did not join the Senator from North Dakota. He was ahead of him in that respect.

Mr. LANGER. Generally that is true, but on this occasion, in connection with the bill to which I have referred, I was ahead of the Senator from Nevada. I introduced the bill.

Mr. President, I now wish to refer to the matter of Communist penetration in Germany.

Today our State Department and the Kremlin are at war with one another over the radio. We have spent millions for the Voice of America program. It is supposed to inform the people behind the iron curtain about the superiority of our way of life, and to wean them away from Moscow. So far as I could learn the program is effective. It is doing much good. Many listen and are glad to hear facts. A Rumanian farmer born in Rumania in 1873 had lived in Cincinnati until 1910. Two of his children were born and live in the United States. One had been born in Rumania. In 1910 his father died. He returned to

Rumania to take over the farm, and remained there until this year. He says the Russians take everything from the small farmer; that men who formerly owned 2,000 acres are now glad to be allowed to work as day laborers on the Danube Canal; that the people eat black bread of poor quality, while the Russians eat bread made from the white flour they take from the peasants; that recently there was a revolt in Hungary; that 84 cars full of men were transported to Siberia, 50 men to each car, and that many had been shot; that the people listen to our radio programs and are waiting for help from the United States to free them from the yoke of Russia; that while Rumanian oil production was plentiful before the Russians came, oil has become scarce there now; that Russian troops were training with tanks and full equipment daily near the village where he lived.

No doubt the men who work on the Voice of America program must know these facts. If I, as a plain traveler, could learn them, surely the State Department through its agents must be even better informed.

The Communists, on the other hand, are not idle. They also broadcast from powerful stations located in Leipzig, Prague, Magdeburg, and other cities in the Russian zone. To overcome their propaganda our stations must of course be equally powerful or more powerful. In this connection, I call attention to another of the many errors of our State Department boys. Some time ago at a conference held in Copenhagen, Denmark, the European radio wave lengths were reallocated. Of course the German areas occupied by the Russians were represented at this conference. But one of our State Department boys made a mistake. We were not represented. I suppose somebody conveniently or deliberately overlooked this meeting. The result was that although our State Department controls the western zone of Germany, and although Munich—or Muenchen, as it is called over there—is in the American zone, the radio wave length of Munich was awarded to the city of Athens, Greece, and so this summer at 8 o'clock at night the Munich radio was silent, but the propaganda from the Russian zone came in full strength. The Germans no longer hear American propaganda, but they hear Russian propaganda, or else they have to shut off their radios. This while we spend millions for the Voice of America program. I have been told that the responsible officials in the State Department were very angry when this happened. I do not know whether the person responsible for this mistake is still on the job. In my opinion he should be fired, but I suppose, like many other fellow travelers and Communists who have been hiding on the payroll, he is still on the job, drawing good pay and neglecting American interests.

Not all the Voice of America programs can be praised. Some have results opposite from what is intended. Or perhaps this opposite result is really intended. Certainly a speech by Ted Williams over the Voice of America on Fri-

day, September 15, 1950, intended to win the Germans to our side in the coming conflict sounded as though it had been written and issued by the Kremlin, rather than by Washington. It certainly did not help win to our side fighters in the coming conflict.

Mr. President, I wish to take up the question of denazification, the subject upon which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] was interrogating me. I am sorry that he has left the Chamber as I go into more detail.

Mr. President, among the policies which have damaged the interests of the United States, the denazification program is in my opinion the worst. Instead of limiting denazification to the active and evil participants and beneficiaries of the Nazi movement, we indiscriminately penalize every German, whether his membership was active or merely nominal.

Mr. President, it is now after 5 o'clock. I very much dislike to discuss this very important subject of denazification with so few Senators present. My speech on that subject will not be long. Let me ask the acting majority leader if it is the plan to take a recess at about 5 o'clock. I should like to resume my speech when more Members of the Senate are present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator wish to place it in the RECORD?

Mr. LANGER. No; I wish to deliver it on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of the pending business, which is the conference report, I may retain the floor tomorrow when the Senate meets at 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent is requested by the senior Senator from North Dakota that he be permitted to retain the floor when the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is, after the conference report is disposed of tomorrow.

Mr. LANGER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request of the Senator from North Dakota is that on Tuesday, after the disposition of the conference report, which is now before the Senate, he be recognized. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### RECESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 19, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 18 (legislative day of November 27), 1950:

##### DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Charles E. Wilson, of New York, to be Director of Defense Mobilization.

##### POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

XCVI—1052

#### ALABAMA

James H. Wilbanks, Ryffle, Ala., in place of J. E. Johnson, retired.

Festus T. Bryan, Glenwood, Ala., in place of P. B. Curtis, retired.

James E. Nettles, Jr., Repton, Ala., in place of M. A. Straughn, transferred.

Stephen H. Greene, Troy, Ala., in place of J. F. Harmon, transferred.

#### CALIFORNIA

Everett M. Fisher, Rio Linda, Calif., in place of M. M. Wilson, retired.

William D. Thornton, Watsonville, Calif., in place of Harry Bridgewater, retired.

#### CONNECTICUT

Jerry C. Cotrone, Old Greenwich, Conn., in place of T. J. Maher, deceased.

Michael L. White, South Woodstock, Conn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1947.

#### FLORIDA

John Kenneth Rogers, Naples, Fla., in place of C. W. Stewart, retired.

Lucius A. Bryant, Jr., Orlando, Fla., in place of J. D. Begg, deceased.

#### GEORGIA

Dorothy K. Moxley, Wadley, Ga., in place of F. H. Moxley, deceased.

#### ILLINOIS

Armanda R. Napoli, Steger, Ill., in place of I. C. Cinnamon, removed.

#### INDIANA

Clyde V. Wolford, Newberry, Ind. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

#### IOWA

Leo J. Miller, Denison, Iowa, in place of H. C. Finner, retired.

Robert E. Allmon, Missouri Valley, Iowa, in place of E. D. Bradley, transferred.

#### MICHIGAN

Leon D. Wallaker, Arcadia, Mich., in place of F. H. Smith, Jr., resigned.

#### MINNESOTA

Ruth G. Mueller, Gaylord, Minn., in place of T. W. Connick, deceased.

Cormac A. Suel, Shakopee, Minn., in place of H. C. Mertz, deceased.

#### MISSISSIPPI

Mary Bell Smith, Midnight, Miss., in place of L. W. Smith, retired.

Jimmy Griffith, Sunflower, Miss., in place of B. M. Sledge, retired.

#### NEBRASKA

Dean J. Ehle, Ponca, Nebr., in the place of J. A. Gunn, removed.

#### NEW JERSEY

Charles D. Tingley, Washington, N. J., in place of F. A. Robertson, deceased.

#### NEW YORK

Harold C. Epke, Holley, N. Y., in place of George Heal, retired.

Hannah M. Curtis, Morrisville, N. Y., in place of W. J. Holbert, deceased.

William J. Cromie, Palmer, N. Y., in place of A. W. Cohan, deceased.

Gerald W. Churchill, Walden, N. Y., in place of Fred Burns, retired.

#### NORTH CAROLINA

Emmett Robinson Wooten, Kinston, N. C., in place of S. C. Sitterson, deceased.

#### PENNSYLVANIA

William L. Bedsworth, Belle Vernon, Pa., in place of George Lange, retired.

William Lester Davis, Peach Glen, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1948.

Joseph F. Sullivan, West Chester, Pa., in place of G. J. Moses, retired.

#### SOUTH DAKOTA

Marion E. Peterson, Arlington, S. Dak., in place of F. C. Wetterberg, retired.

#### TEXAS

Arlon T. Carroll, Crane, Tex., in place of J. T. Butler, resigned.

Clarence R. Wiley, Fort Stockton, Tex., in place of A. W. Dunn, deceased.

Roland A. Johnson, McCamey, Tex., in place of R. S. Guyton, resigned.

#### UTAH

Franklin G. Slauch, Vernal, Utah, in place of Pontha Calder, retired.

#### VIRGINIA

Charles F. Shuler, Elkton, Va., in place of J. H. Miller, retired.

Howard S. Myers, Virginia Beach, Va., in place of W. R. M. Moss, deceased.

Samuel H. Hale, Wise, Va., in place of J. M. Roberson, transferred.

#### WEST VIRGINIA

Elizabeth D. Burch, Smithers, W. Va., in place of R. C. Bell, declined.

#### WISCONSIN

Harry J. Kelley, Manitowoc, Wis., in place of H. F. Kelley, retired.

Gordon E. Schuler, Plymouth, Wis., in place of A. W. Schiereck, retired.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, DECEMBER 18, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in this time of national emergency, life for all of us is taking on a new seriousness and a deeper earnestness for we are confronted by dangers which threaten to destroy our liberties.

We are beginning to realize that we are citizens of this great Nation, not merely to receive benefits and enjoy the blessings of freedom without hindrance but we must now defend and preserve them at any cost.

Grant that we may be loyal to the memory and tradition of our forefathers who cherished lofty ideals and whose spirit of sternness and simplicity, of struggle and sacrifice, of faith and hope, shone brightly even in the darkest days.

We know that if we are derelict in our devotion or yield to despair we shall be traitors to the faithful of all ages, traitors to our fellow citizens, who are now fighting so valiantly, and traitors to our God.

We pray that we may take more seriously the matter of our personal loyalty to Thee, walking in the ways of righteousness and holding fast the faith that Thy divine purpose cannot be defeated.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 15, 1950, was read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its-enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2093. An act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to execute a quitclaim deed to property owned by Jacob F. Riedel;